NATIONALISM

By

G. P. GOOCH

Author of "History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century," "Germany and the French Revolution," "Life of Lord Courtney," etc.

1920

London
THE SWARTHMORE PRESS LTD.
72, Oxford Street, W.1

New York:
HARCOURT BRACE & HOWE
1, West 47th Street

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
	INTRODUCTION - - - - -	5
I	THE FRENCH REVOLUTION - - -	9
II	THE AGE OF METTERNICH - - -	19
III	THE UNIFICATION OF ITALY AND GERMANY	40
IV	THE LIQUIDATION OF TURKEY - -	60
V	BEFORE THE GREAT WAR - - -	76
VI	THE AWAKENING OF THE EAST - -	92
VII	ARMAGEDDON - - - - -	108

INTRODUCTION

THE core of nationalism is group-consciousness, the love of the community, great or small, to which we belong; but for the larger portion of the prehistoric and historic life of mankind such love of our unit has been an instinctive emotion, not a doctrine. While patriotism is as old as human association and has gradually widened its sphere from the clan and the tribe to the city and the state, nationalism as an operative principle and an articulate creed only made its appearance among the more complicated intellectual processes of the modern world. The august conception of the unity of Christendom under the joint sway of Emperor and Pope was almost as unfavourable to national differentiation as had been the universalism of the Roman Empire; and though the latter centuries of the Middle Ages witnessed the steady growth of national consciousness and the high-souled patriotism of Joan of Arc, it was not until the political and religious system of mediæval Europe went down before the combined assaults of the Renaissance and the Reformation that the sovereign state emerged as the dominant type of political organisation. In the fulness of time the doctrine of nationalism issued from the volcanic fires of the French Revolution, carrying its virile message of emancipation and defiance to the uttermost parts of the earth, and filling the nineteenth century with the insistent clamour of its demands.

Nationalism is the self-consciousness of a nation, and its flowing current is fed by many streams. The nation

is an organism, a spiritual entity. All attempts to penetrate its secrets by the light of mechanical interpretations break down before the test of experience. The occupation of a naturally defined territory, which supplies the simplest tie of affinity, will not carry us far; for the conviction of national unity is sublimely indifferent to rivers, mountains and even seas. Nor is identity of racial type an indispensable factor of nationhood; for no race has ever been gathered into a single Nation-state, while Great Britain and France, Belgium, Switzerland and the United States remind us that countries where national self-consciousness is most highly developed are peopled by men of different blood. Unity of language, again, despite its immense practical convenience, can hardly be described as a necessity with the example of Belgium and Switzerland, Canada and South Africa before our eyes. Religious unity, in turn, though a potent bond of union, above all in communities such as the Poles, the Irish or the Armenians which have lost or have never won independent political existence, becomes ever less essential with the growing secularisation of thought. And finally, common economic interests avail as little as forced obedience to a single ruler to achieve the birth of nation.

Though neither the occupation of a defined area, nor community of race, language, religion, government or economic interests are indispensable to national self-consciousness, each of these factors constitutes a powerful tie and tends to produce the cohesiveness and solidarity in which the strength of nations resides. Indeed in the absence of such connecting links it would be childish to expect a vigorous national sentiment. Yet, while

admitting to the full the natural foundations of nationalism, we shall never discover its innermost secret if we confine our scrutiny to the material plane. Its spiritual characteristics have become increasingly recognised since Mazzini, the noblest of its prophets, and are now axioms among thoughtful publicists in both hemispheres. "A portion of mankind may be said to constitute a Nationality," wrote Mill in 1862, in his *Representative Government*, "if they are united among themselves by common sympathies, which do not exist between them and any others, which make them co-operate more willingly than with other people, desire to be under the same government, and desire that it should be government by themselves, or a portion of themselves, exclusively. This feeling of nationality may have been generated by various causes. Sometimes it is the effect of identity of race and descent. Community of language and community of religion greatly contribute to it. Geographical limits are one of its causes. But the strongest of all is the identity of political antecedents; the possession of a national history, and consequent community of recollections; collective pride and humiliation, pleasure and regret, connected with the same incidents in the past." Renan's celebrated lecture, *Qu'est ce qu'une Nation?* leads to the same conclusion. "What constitutes a nation is not speaking the same tongue or belonging to the same ethnic group, but having accomplished great things in common in the past and the wish to accomplish them in the future." "A nation," pronounces Littré, the eminent philologist, "is an union of men inhabiting the same territory, whether or not subject to the same government, and possessing

such common interests of long standing that they may be regarded as belonging to the same race." "As the culture of a people advances," argues Laveleye, the Belgian economist, "race exercises less power over all people, and historic memories more." "A nationality," echoes Durkheim, the Belgian sociologist, with admirable brevity, "is a group of which the members, for racial or merely historic reasons, wish to live under the same laws and form a state." "Nationality, like religion," we learn from Professor Zimmern, "is subjective; psychological; a condition of mind; a spiritual possession; a way of feeling, thinking and living."

The path is now clear for our advance. Nationalism denotes the resolve of a group of human beings to share their fortunes, and to exercise exclusive control over their own actions. Where such a conscious determination exists there should be a state, and there will be no abiding peace until there is a state. Where there is a soul there should be a body in which it may dwell. Here is the master-key to the political history of the nineteenth century.

Chapter I

THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

I

When the States-General met at Versailles in 1789, the nation looked with confident assurance to the King. The *Cahiers*, in which we hear the authentic accents of France, demanded the removal of concrete abuses, but made no claim that the rudder should be entrusted to the representatives of the people. The King was assumed to be the champion of his subjects against feudal oppression. When, however, guided by evil counsellors, he emerged rather the enemy than the leader of the political and social reformation, the notion that sovereignty resided in the people and its selected representatives, spread with the rapidity of a prairie fire. The oath of the Tennis Court asserted the determination of the assembly to disobey the royal command, and proclaimed it the organ of the national will. Sieyès' pamphlet claimed that the Tiers État, which had hitherto been nothing, was in reality everything. The Declaration of the Rights of Man substituted reason for tradition as the guiding principle of politics. Finally the women's march to Versailles, resulting in the transfer of the Court in virtual captivity to Paris, left the Assembly visibly no less than actually supreme. Theoretical royalism lingered on till the flight to Varennes convinced France that her ruler had ceased to belong to the nation, and that she must act for herself.

France had become self-conscious in her victorious struggle with the Crown and its advisers; but it was under the stress of attack from outside that the sentiment of nationality reached its full stature. When the Great War was inaugurated by France in April, 1792, Brissot's policy was resisted by Robespierre and other Jacobin chiefs. But when the first skirmishes revealed the weakness of the troops, when Brunswick launched his menacing Manifesto and marched into France, the monarchy was overthrown and the nation rose in wrathful might to hurl back the invader. Men become fully conscious of the ties which bind them to their country only when it is threatened or visited by some overwhelming calamity. The tide of battle turned at Valmy, and on the evening after the skirmish Goethe, who had accompanied his friend and master, Karl August of Weimar, replied to a request for his opinion in the historic words, "From to-day begins a new era of world-history; and you will be able to say that you were present at its birth." The poet was right. The titanic energy of France, which had since 1789 been devoted to the task of internal reform, now turned to meet the foe. The second stage of the revolution had begun, and nationalism blossomed forth in irresistible strength. The leaders of 1789 had never entertained a thought of war or aggression, and the Constitution of 1791 had declared that France would never fight for conquests. But when blood began to flow and the achievements of the Revolution were imperilled, France turned into a nation of supermen, whose volcanic energy scattered the hosts of feudal Europe like chaff before the blast.

It was not to be expected that the victorious troops of the Republic would halt on the frontier when the invader had been expelled. The doctrine of the natural limits of France, the frontiers marked by nature,—the Rhine, the Alps and the Pyrenees,—was proclaimed by Danton and echoed from a thousand throats. Moreover, the people which had won its liberty and defended it against foreign attack could now aid others to follow in its footsteps. On November 19th, 1792, the Convention resolved to "assist all peoples who wished to recover their liberty." The formula, which might seem quixotically unselfish, proved to be merely a cloak for aggression, since French soldiers and agents were the judges of whether the peoples were desirous of "liberty," which, it was assumed, could only be enjoyed by annexation to the French Republic. Thus in the space of a few months militant nationalism revealed not only its magical power of mobilising the latent strength of a people, but the temptation to a virile nation to carry fire and sword into the lands of its neighbours.

II

As France was stung into full national self-consciousness in 1792 by the Brunswick Manifesto, so Prussian patriotism was kindled into flame by the battle of Jena. The eighteenth century was the age of cosmopolitanism, and nowhere was the soil more favourable to its growth than in Germany. Almost without exception her leading minds owned allegiance to humanity alone. In a land cut up into innumerable petty states, mostly ill-governed, particularism was the instinct of the masses,

cosmopolitanism the creed of the *élite*. Excluded from power and responsibility, men of liberal views felt themselves in closer association with reformers and thinkers in other lands than with their own countrymen. To such minds patriotism meant stagnation, a mulish antagonism to the stimulating challenge of foreign influences. "German nationalism," declared Nicolai bluntly, "is a political monstrosity." "To be praised as a zealous patriot," wrote Lessing, "is the last thing I desire—a patriot, that is, who would teach me to forget that I must be a citizen of the world." The attitude of the leaders of the Aufklarung was shared by the men who ushered in a new period in the intellectual life of Germany. "If we find a place where we can rest with our belongings," wrote the youthful Goethe, "a field to support us, a house to shelter us, have we not a Fatherland? Ubi bene, ibi patria." "I write as a citizen of the world who serves no prince," echoed the youthful Schiller. "I lost my Fatherland to exchange it for the great world. What is the greatest of nations but a fragment?"

The war against the French Revolution was never popular in Germany, and it was often said that the only man who entered into it with heart and soul was the King of Prussia, Frederick William II. When military failure and financial stringency led Prussia to make peace with the Republic by the Treaty of Basle in 1795, a sigh of relief went up from North Germany. During the decade of peace that ensued Brunswick and other military and civilian counsellors discussed in confidential memoranda the reasons for the collapse of the army of Frederick the Great before the levies of the Republic, and found them, above all, in the want of national

spirit; but it was not till the disastrous campaign which opened at Jena and closed at Tilsit that the rotten foundations of the Prussian state were exposed to the gaze of all the world, and even the King realised that he must break with the past. The best men of North and Central Germany gave their services to Prussia. In his brief but memorable ministry Stein emancipated the peasants from the feudal yoke, and granted self-government to the municipalities. Hardenberg completed the creation of a free peasantry. Scharnhorst introduced compulsory service, and trained the army which was to overthrow Napoleon at Leipsic. Acting on the memorable utterance of the King, "We must seek compensation on the spiritual plane for what we have lost in material strength," Wilhelm von Humboldt founded the University of Berlin, and made it the first seat of learning in Europe.

The necessity of such reforms had been widely recognised before the *débâcle*; but the energy to carry them out was lacking till the sentiment of nationality was born in the crisis of the nation's fate. While some of the leaders of the Prussian renaissance approved the "principles of 1789" and others abhorred them, they all recognised that the terrible strength of the foe was generated by the individual and national self-consciousness bred of the Revolution, and that if Prussia was to regain her independence she must build from the depths. "Your majesty," declared Hardenberg, "we must do from above what the French have done from below." "One cause above all has raised France to this pinnacle of greatness," wrote Gneisenau. "The Revolution awakened all her powers and gave to every

individual a suitable field for his activity. What infinite aptitudes slumber in the bosom of a nation! Why do not the courts take steps to open up a career to it wherever it is found, to encourage talents and virtues whatever the rank? The Revolution has set the whole strength of a nation in motion, and by the equalisation of classes converted the living strength of men and the dead strength of resources into a productive capital, and thereby upset the old relations of states and the old equilibrium. If other states desire to restore their equilibrium, they must employ the same instruments."

The work of her statesmen was reinforced by the appeal of her thinkers and her poets. The most eloquent voice in the kingdom was Fichte, who had begun life as a cosmopolitan, and whose career as a publicist spans the transition from cosmopolitanism to nationalism. In his lectures on the "Characteristics of the Present Age," delivered in the year before the battle of Jena, he asks "Which is the fatherland of the truly cultured European?" "It is Europe, and more particularly that state which at any given time has reached the highest point of culture. Animated by this sentiment we need not fret about the fortunes of particular states." But the thunder of Napoleon's guns transformed Fichte into the most fervent and eloquent champion of the national state. The "Addresses to the German Nation," delivered within earshot of the French garrison in Berlin and at the peril of his life, proclaimed the birth of the gospel of which his countrymen were one day to become fanatical devotees. "I speak for Germans," he cried, "brushing aside all the differences which unhappy events have created during centuries in the

single nation. These lectures, delivered first to you, are meant for the whole nation. They are intended to kindle a patriotic flame." Where Hegel saw nothing but the state, Fichte discerned the nation. Schiller's "Wilhelm Tell" became the bible of patriots; the songs of Arndt and Körner voiced the new passion for action and self-sacrifice; and the Gymnastic societies of Father Jahn braced heart and muscle for the supreme efforts of the Wars of Liberation.

III

Napoleon's invasion of Spain produced a fiercer explosion of wrath than his invasion of Prussia; but in the latter case the flame he had kindled continued to burn, while in the former, after emitting sparks of dazzling brilliance, it quickly flickered out. The difference is explained by the fact that the German mind was awake, and that the issues were formulated by an army of writers and speakers, whereas the peninsula was cut off from the intellectual movements of Europe by a barrier of ignorance and indifference more formidable than the Pyrenees. The country had possessed one or two men of wider outlook, such as Campomanes, Jovellanos, and Llorente, the historian of the Inquisition; and Charles III had ranked among the Enlightened Despots of the eighteenth century. But the people as a whole were wedded to their traditional beliefs and practices, and asked nothing of their neighbours but to be let alone. Such a nation could be relied on to resist attack with a passion of pride and fury; but when the danger was past it would revert to the old paths.

Napoleon, who had been surprised at the weakness of Prussia's resistance, was even more astonished by the vigorous opposition of the peninsula. He shared the common notion that the sun of Spain had set; and the conduct of the senile Charles IV and his son Ferdinand confirmed his contempt. When the king had signed the treaty of Bayonne resigning his right to the throne, and French troops were in occupation of Madrid, Barcelona, and the chief towns of the north, the Emperor imagined that the country was at his mercy. But the disgraceful surrender of the Court provoked an outburst of volcanic fury. Napoleon and his royal dupes had forgotten the Spanish people, which, with instinctive unanimity, rose against the invader. The province of Asturias in the North-West was the first to organise a Junta, which at once declared war and despatched deputies to England to beg help, a request instantly granted by Canning. As Valmy turned the tide of Brunswick's invasion and thrilled republican France with self-confidence, the capitulation of twenty thousand French troops at Baylen taught Spain that even Napoleon was not invincible. The emperor at once crossed the Pyrenees and scattered the Spanish levies; but the country was unconquered and unconquerable. The house to house defence of Saragossa under the command of Palafox against a large investing force with heavy artillery, maintained till the city was in ruins, revealed to the world that in arousing the slumbering spirit of patriotism among the people the Emperor had created a force more formidable than the disciplined armies which he had so often overcome. Till the Russian campaign diverted the attention and resources of the

Empire there was no chance of victory; but the steady opposition, fed by unquenchable hate, gnawed at the vitals of French power. Readers of Marbot's Memoirs can never forget his picture of the difficulties of campaigning in the Peninsula.

While the armies of France were still in possession of most of the cities of Spain, deputies and refugees from the unconquered and conquered provinces met at Cadiz in 1812 to draw up a new constitution. They found their model in the French constitution of 1791, declared that sovereignty resided in the nation, abolished feudalism and the Inquisition and dissolved the Monastic Orders. In thus decreeing a revolution the legislators of Cadiz lost touch with the people; and when the dynasty was restored on the downfall of Napoleon its reforms were swept away without protest. The intellectual and moral discipline which in Germany preceded the appeal to arms had no counter-part in the Peninsula. In Germany nationalism was formulated as a doctrine and took its place as a guiding principle. In Spain resistance to the invader was like a fire of straw, blazing up with bewildering rapidity and falling back into ashes when the enemy was consumed in the fierce flame. Germany emerged from her martyrdom resolved to learn and to apply the lessons which had made her enemy powerful and victorious. Spain complacently returned to her dynasty and her autocracy, her Inquisition and her obscurantism; and Ferdinand VII ruled as if the French Revolution had never occurred and as if her legislators had never flocked to Cadiz. But the torch of emancipation was kindled in South

South American nationalism dates its origin; and Spain's valiant struggle gave new hope to the nations which were still under the Emperor's yoke. The basis of nationalism is instinct; but the nationalism that rests on instinct alone will never enlarge and purify a nation's soul. True nationalism must build the independence of a nation on the foundation of the free and enlightened citizenship which formed the ideal of the men who made the French Revolution and preached its gospel to a listening world.

Chapter II

THE AGE OF METTERNICH

While the conflict with Napoleon was still undecided, the spokesman of the Grand Alliance paid lip-service to the spirit of nationality in which their hope of victory lay. "The object of the war and of the peace," they proclaimed, "is to secure the rights, the freedom and the independence of all nations." The Tsar Alexander might use such language without insincerity; but his Prussian and Austrian comrades could attach no intelligible meaning to the words. During the prolonged discussions at the Vienna Congress there was no recognition of national aspirations except in the creation of a partially autonomous Poland. The guiding principles of the victors were to erect barriers against France, and to reward or punish minor states for their part in the Great War. The overthrow of Napoleon was due to the combined resistance of outraged and threatened nations; but the peoples derived little benefit from their victory. One great enemy of constitutional and national liberty was succeeded by another; and the yoke of Metternich, if less brutally oppressive, was no less difficult to shake off. With England standing aloof, the power of the Holy Alliance was unchallenged; and the three rulers, Alexander, Francis I and Frederick William III, had suffered so much during the revolutionary era that the suppression of popular movements and ideas had become their governing principle of statesmanship.

Yet nationalism had taken firm root in Europe; and the history of the generation that followed the downfall of Napoleon is the record of the successful and unsuccessful struggles of nationalities for self-determination and self-realisation in face of entrenched and embattled autocracy.

I

No provision of the settlement of 1815 has incurred more criticism than the union of Belgium with Holland. Belgium had been conquered by the French Republic, and there was no desire in Vienna to regain its remote province. It had never been independent; and if it were now erected into a sovereign state it would be too weak to stand alone. If, on the other hand, it were joined to Holland, the enlarged Dutch Monarchy would form a barrier against French ambitions in the north. It was true that the two countries had parted company in the sixteenth century, and that they differed in language, religion and sentiment; but such considerations were of little weight compared with the necessity of check-mating the arch-disturber of the peace of Europe.

The tendency of recent historians is to argue that, since Belgium was not yet a nation, Castlereagh's plan was perhaps the best under the circumstances, and that if Holland had played the part assigned to her with greater skill the arrangement would have been justified by success. Unfortunately, King William inherited the militant Protestantism of his Orange ancestors, and launched a crusade against his benighted Catholic subjects. Before long the Church was in revolt, and the ardent piety of Belgium rallied to its support. Secular

grievances were soon added to ecclesiastical complaints. The four million Belgians returned no more members to the States-General than the two million Dutch, and when their interests clashed the dispute was settled in favour of the northern half of the kingdom. Dutch became the official language of the public services, the schools and the courts. Faced by these attacks on their religion and language, Catholics and Liberals, laying aside their feuds, demanded the maintenance of their rights under the Constitution and a separate administration. National sentiment, which had been a tiny rill in 1815, had grown into a flowing river which was soon to overflow its banks.

In July, 1830, Paris rose against Charles X and chased him out of the country. The news of the Revolution excited Belgium to fever pitch; and on August 5th, the King's birthday, cries were raised in the Brussels Opera against Holland. The ferment spread to the streets, and the standard of revolt was hoisted on the Town Hall. A Dutch army advancing on Brussels was met with resistance and retired after a bombardment. The Committee of Defence blossomed into a Provisional Government, which proclaimed the dissolution of the ties binding Belgians to Holland, and ordered Belgian soldiers in the army to return to their own country. The States-General now voted the separation of the countries by a narrow majority; but the time for compromise was past. The example of Brussels had proved contagious. All the provinces followed the lead of Brabant, and Luxemburg associated itself with the revolt. On October 4th the independence of Belgium was formally proclaimed by the Provisional Government,

which announced its resolve to summon a Constituent Assembly. France and England threw their shield over Belgium, and, despite the repugnance of the Tsar Nicholas to condone revolution, the Powers accepted the principle of separation. King William struggled for years to retain his grip on the country, and when a British and French force compelled him to relax it, he abdicated in disgust. It required almost a decade of war and negotiation to cut the knot tied in 1815; but in 1839 Belgium, neutralised indeed but independent, entered the family of European states under her wise ruler Leopold of Coburg.

II

Equally successful, though bought at a far higher price, was the effort of Greece to throw off a heavier yoke. After long preparation the Morea rose in 1821 and massacred every Turk within reach. At the end of the year the whole peninsula, except a few fortresses, was in the hand of the rebels, and the insurrection blazed up north of the Gulf of Corinth and in the islands of the archipelago. Possessing no trained soldiers the Greeks practised guerrilla warfare, while their sailors preyed upon Turkish commerce, and fire-ships set light to their men of war. The revolt of Ali Pasha at first prevented the concentration of the full strength of Turkey against the rebels; but the death of the Albanian chieftain released the troops, and in 1823 Mehemet Ali sent a fleet to the support of his overlord. The cause of Greece would have been lost had not Europe come to her aid. The hanging of the Greek Patriarch in Constantinople

in 1821, in retaliation for the massacres in the Morea, had aroused a crusading fervour in Russia; and in 1822 the extermination of the population of Chios sent a thrill of horror through Christendom. Canning's recognition of the Greeks as belligerents in 1823 brought the matter within the competence of the Powers; but when the Tsar proposed the creation of three autonomous Greek states under Turkish sovereignty, but guaranteed by the Powers, Metternich and Canning refused consent, the latter suggesting the recognition of complete independence. While the Powers were exchanging notes with each other and with the Sultan, Mehemet Ali, at the request of his suzerain, sent a well-drilled army of 4,500 men to the Morea early in 1825 under his son Ibrahim, who operated from Crete. By the end of the year the Egyptian troops had conquered the peninsula; but when Nicholas succeeded his brother Alexander, England, Russia and France agreed on the coercion of Turkey. The battle of Navarino in 1827 destroyed the Egyptian fleet; and when the Sultan in reply proclaimed a Holy War, Russian troops crossed the Balkans and brought Turkey to her knees. In 1832, eleven years after the outbreak of the revolt, Greece was recognised as an independent state, and in 1833, Otto, second son of King Ludwig of Bavaria, entered Athens as her first King. The rivalries of the Powers and the lingering sympathy with Turkey among the more reactionary statesmen were responsible for the drawing of frontiers which left the larger part of the Greek race outside the new state. But the foundations had been well and truly laid; and the history of the succeeding century is in large measure the record of the efforts to add *Græcia*

irredenta—on the mainland and in Asia Minor, in the Adriatic, the Ægean and the Mediterranean—to the little realm.

III

While Belgium and Greece won their independence with foreign aid, friendless Poland endeavoured in vain to regain her place among the States of Europe. The three Partitions of her territory between Russia, Prussia and Austria had been followed by a gleam of hope when her oppressors were successively overthrown by Napoleon; but the Grand Duchy of Warsaw, though placed under the King of Saxony, was in reality ruled from Paris and regarded by the Emperor mainly as a reservoir of soldiers. On the fall of the Empire the Polish question came up for discussion at the Congress of Vienna, and proved the thorniest of its many problems. As a young man Alexander had learned from his bosom friend Adam Czartoryski to sympathise with Polish aspirations; and he determined to endow his Polish subjects with a full measure of autonomy, despite the fact that they had fought with enthusiasm in the armies of his great enemy. Treaties for the creation of "the Congress Kingdom" were signed with Austria and Prussia, and a few months after the close of the Congress the Tzar issued the promised constitution. A Diet, with the right to amend and reject legislation, was to meet every two years; Russia undertook to pay for the Polish army; and Poles alone were to be employed in the administration. The settlement was liberally

conceived and granted in all sincerity; but Castlereagh's prophecy that the Poles would not be content, and that Alexander's system would either be deliberately destroyed or perish at the hands of his successor, was to be fulfilled to the letter.

The Polish kingdom had fallen owing to its unwieldy size and heterogeneous population, its impossible constitution and its geographical position between greedy and powerful neighbours. Its dying struggles had been ennobled by Kosciusko, whose name henceforth became the symbol of national existence; and the flame of patriotism burnt more fiercely when Poland was a soul without a body. For a time the new system, commended by the personal fascination of the monarch, seem to hold out hopes of success. The first Diet was opened by the Tsar in 1818, and in 1820 his brother Constantine, the head of the Polish army, married a Polish wife. But the honeymoon was brief. Alexander's liberalism, perhaps never much more than skin-deep, evaporated after the close of the war; and when the Diet of 1820 rejected two government measures, he took no pains to conceal his irritation. The Poles, who had never surrendered the hope of complete independence, accepted the constitution of 1815 as an instalment; and when rumours spread that the Tsar was more likely to suspend the Constitution than to enlarge it, secret societies were formed in the towns and the army.

Shortly after opening the third Diet in 1825 Alexander died; and his successor Nicholas detested the Polish and all other constitutions. In 1830 the Poles themselves provided him with the desired excuse to sweep it away. The July Revolution in Paris set light to the inflammable

material which had accumulated since 1815. An insurrection broke out in Warsaw, Constantine fled from the city, and the Diet met and approved the Revolution. Nicholas replied by a demand for unconditional submission and the despatch of troops. The Diet, undismayed, proclaimed the throne vacant and declared the right of the Poles, as an independent people, to choose their ruler. Two hundred thousand Russian troops now crossed the frontier, and in a fierce battle outside the gates of the capital the rebels were defeated. The Russians were weakened by the terrible epidemic of cholera which ravaged Europe in 1831, and by insurrections in their rear; but when the siege of Warsaw was begun in September, the city was unable to resist, and an assault was forestalled by an offer of unconditional surrender. Nicholas would have preferred to suppress Polish liberties *en bloc;* but owing to protests from England and France he substituted an Organic Statute for his brother's constitution, a nominated Council of State taking the place of the elected Diet. Ruthless punishments were inflicted on the rebels, the universities and schools were closed, and the country was governed from St. Petersburg by a new Polish Department. The plottings of exiles, the denunciations of Mickiewicz, the national poet, and Lelewel, the national historian, and futile risings were followed by the abolition of the Organic Statute in 1847; and in 1846 the tiny Republic of Cracow, the last relic of Polish independence, was swallowed up in Austria. In 1863 a second unsuccessful revolt was followed by the loss of the last vestiges of liberty in Russian Poland.

IV

While the dead hand of Metternich and Nicholas lay heavy on Europe, every movement towards national or constitutional liberty was regarded as Jacobinism. During the eighteenth century Hungary had enjoyed a large measure of self-government; and though the Emperor Joseph struck out madly at Magyar constitutional rights, his brother Leopold quickly restored them. Though Hungary had aided Austria in the struggle against Napoleon, the Emperor Francis used his victory to extend the system of absolute rule from Vienna to Budapest. His first step was to order a levy of 35,000 recruits for the army, without requesting the assent of the Diet. The attack on constitutional privilege awakened the national spirit, and after a lively contest Francis withdrew his claim, and summoned the Diet in 1825.

The Magyar cause found a leader in Szechenyi, who had fought as a young officer in the Napoleonic wars and had subsequently travelled in France and England, bringing back a living sense of the value of Parliamentary institutions. His first speech in the Upper House struck a new note; for it was delivered in Hungarian instead of Latin, hitherto the official language of the House of Magnates. His next step was to found a Hungarian Academy of Sciences, contributing for the purpose one year's income from his immense estates. Refusing to identify himself with any political party, he strove to improve the economic condition of the country. "Do not constantly trouble yourselves with the vanished glories of the past," he wrote, "but rather let your

patriotism aim at the prosperity of the beloved fatherland. Many there are who think that Hungary *has been;* but for my part I like to think that Hungary *shall be.*" Among his many achievements in the economic field were the development of horse-breeding, the encouragement of navigation on the Danube, and the reclamation of swamps by the regulation of the Theiss. It was mainly owing to his initiative that Buda-Pesth was transformed into one of the finest capitals in Europe, and that an imposing suspension bridge was built to connect the two parts of the city. His unselfish patriotism provided a model for the nobility, and his determination to make Hungary a prosperous and cultured state was the essential preliminary to a demand for fuller political rights.

From 1825 to 1840 Szechenyi spoke for his compatriots; but his concentration of effort on economic and cultural progress could not satisfy the small gentry and the bourgeoisie who clamoured for political advance. The idea that material prosperity and political liberty should be sought simultaneously was preached by Kossuth and Deak. While Szechenyi was a wealthy aristocrat, Kossuth belonged to the poorer class of country gentry, and earned his living as a lawyer. He became a national figure in 1832 when he circumvented the Government veto on printed reports of the debates in the Diet by writing out the speeches in his own hand and having them copied. In vain did the Government endeavour to stop the circulation; and when the session was over, Kossuth started a new manuscript paper which reported the debates of the county assemblies, thus bringing the counties into touch and enabling

them to concert action against the authorities. The fearless editor ignored the command to cease publication, and was sentenced to three years' imprisonment in 1838. Pardoned in 1840 at the urgent request of the Diet, Kossuth founded the *Pesti Hirlap* in 1841, the first political daily in Hungary, preaching the abolition of the privileges of the nobility, and voicing the demands of western liberalism with convincing eloquence.

Szechenyi declared that he had no objection to Kossuth's programme, but that his methods led straight to revolution. But the unyielding attitude of Vienna and the conduct of the reactionary elements in the House of Magnates strengthened the belief that a policy of political neutrality was out of date. Kossuth was elected to the diet of 1847-8, and proved himself even greater as an orator than as a journalist. When the wave of revolution started from Paris in 1848, he urged the creation of a responsible Ministry; but the Upper House refused to support the demand. A few weeks later the revolution spread to Vienna, and Metternich fled in disguise. The Diet seized the opportunity to demand constitutional Government, which was promptly conceded by the Emperor Ferdinand. Authority was entrusted to a Ministry responsible to Parliament, equality before the law was established, the privileges of the nobility were abolished, religious toleration and freedom of the press guaranteed, and a National Guard was created. The first ministry included the three great leaders of Hungarian nationalism, Szechenyi, Kossuth and Deak; but the soul of the National Assembly created by the new Constitution was Kossuth.

The fair dawn was quickly overcast by the selfish

refusal of the Magyars to share their new-found liberties with the non-Magyar races; and the wise Szechenyi accused Kossuth of goading them to madness against the Magyar nation. A fierce racial war broke out in Hungary, Slovaks and Roumanians, Croats and Serbs, Saxons and Ruthenes alike rallying to the Hapsburg dynasty. A Magyar army was quickly raised, and Jellacic, the Ban of Croatia, who was marching on Budapesth, was repulsed; but Prince Windischgrätz, having crushed the revolution in Vienna, invaded Hungary, and occupied the capital. The Magyar armies found a brilliant leader in Gorgei; but when the Parliament, led by Kossuth, declared the House of Hapsburg to have forfeited its right to the Crown of Hungary by invading the country, the Tsar Nicholas, who regarded himself as the champion of legitimism, despatched 200,000 Russian soldiers across the Carpathians. Görgei surrendered at Vilagos, and Kossuth sought refuge in Turkey, and finally, after a triumphant tour through England and the United States, settled in Italy. Wholesale executions followed the suppression of the revolt, and the state of siege was continued for five years. Kossuth's bold bid for national independence was frustrated; but the Magyars had won self-consciousness in the struggle, and the songs of Petofi, who had died on the battle-field, were sung in secret till Hungary obtained independence in everything but name by the Compromise of 1867.

V

While the revival of Hungarian nationalism was the work of men of action, the renaissance of Bohemia was

due to the labours of a little band of scholars. In other countries historical study has accompanied the revival of national feeling; in Bohemia it created it. Since the battle of the White Hill in 1620 the country had lain prostrate beneath the feet of its Austrian rulers, who had spared no effort to stamp out every symbol and memory of national life. A systematic destruction of Bohemian books was begun, and a fanatical Jesuit boasted of having burnt 60,000 volumes. The Czech language ceased to be used for literary expression, its place being taken by German and Latin. Every book published in the Austrian dominions had to run the gauntlet of two censors, one representing the Government, the other the Church. Education was in the hands of the Jesuits, whose aim was to make Bohemians forget that John Hus ever existed. For almost two centuries the cultural life of the country was smitten with paralysis. Among the sins of the Hapsburgs there is none greater than this truceless warfare against the soul of a people.

Though Joseph II was no friend of national aspirations, it was during his reign that the first breach in the iron system of repression was made. A Czech newspaper was established in Prague, and foreign works were allowed to appear in Czech translations. A Bohemian Society of Sciences was established, which, though German alone was used in its deliberations, revived the interest in national history. Dobrovsky, a Jesuit, who wrote in German and Latin, learnt Czech as a foreign language, and, though destitute of national sentiment, compiled a Bohemian grammar and a history of Bohemian literature and language. With the opening of the nineteenth century the scene changes rapidly, and

a tiny group of scholars, writing in their native language, called the attention of the world to the literature and history of Bohemia. " If the ceiling of this room were to fall and crush us," remarked one of them, " there would be an end of the national movement." Jungmann wrote a history of Bohemian literature. Kollar, a Slovak clergyman, sang the historic and legendary glories of Slavdom in *The Daughter of Slava*, a vast collection of sonnets. A treatise on Slavic Antiquities by Safarik, another Slovak, was the first attempt to recover the early history and culture of the Slavs.

By far the most influential member of the circle was Palacky, the greatest of Slav historians and the chief architect of the national consciousness. The child of Lutheran Slovaks, he was brought up in the traditions of the Bohemian Brothers, and introduced by Dobrovsky to the few nobles who were interested in Bohemian history, and by whom a National Museum had been established at Prague in 1818 for the collection of artistic and literary antiquities. When Palacky argued that the indifference was rather the fault of the directors than of the people, he was answered that it was too late to raise the Bohemian nation from the dead. The young scholar replied that no attempt was being made. In 1828 he founded a Journal of the Museum, and the first-fruits of his studies were contained in a volume on early Bohemian historians. When he became aware of the wealth of material stored in the dusty archives of the castles, he resolved to take the whole of Bohemian history for his province. He was appointed Historiographer with a salary; and though the appointment was vetoed at Vienna, the Diet was allowed to defray the expenses of publication.

The first volume of *The History of the Bohemian People*, published in 1836, idealised the culture of the primitive Czechs; but the work only attracted general attention when the narrative reached the century of Hus. While the reformer had been pilloried as a fanatic and his followers as savages in German and Catholic publications, Palacky revealed the nobility of the national hero, and shewed that the cruelties of the Husite Generals were surpassed by their enemies. The volumes on the heroic era of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, with the resplendent figure of Hus in the foreground, burst on his countrymen like a revelation, and aroused corresponding resentment in Vienna. He was compelled to suppress certain passages and to insert interpolations from the censor's pen as his own work. Shortly after this unworthy coercion of the great scholar the Revolution of 1848 broke out. The police censorship being abolished, the historian restored the omissions and expunged the interpolations. With Havlicek, the greatest of Bohemian journalists, he was now the authorised spokesman of his nation. He presided over the first Pan-Slav Congress at Prague, the Slavonic counterpart to the Frankfurt Parliament, and was elected to the Constituent Assembly at Vienna. When absolutism was restored, he returned to his study.

Palacky's first intention had been to bring his narrative down to the fatal year 1620; but he finally determined to lay down his pen in 1526 with the accession of the Hapsburgs. His experience of the Catholic censor was sufficiently disagreeable. The guardian of the prestige of the Hapsburgs would have added to his terrors and rendered an account of the Reformation century

virtually impossible. Moreover he required ten volumes even for his limited design. Written originally in German the book appeared after 1848 simultaneously in both languages, and on revision the early volumes were translated into Czech. It was his aim and his achievement to recreate the history of his country; and his work was not only a landmark in scholarship but a political event, a trumpet-call to an oppressed nationality to raise its head and prove itself worthy of its illustrious past. His famous words in declining an invitation to the Frankfurt Parliament in 1848, "If Austria ceased to exist, it would be necessary to re-create her," expressed his conviction that the restoration of Bohemia's national life could be realised within the ambit of the Hapsburg Empire; and the promise of Francis Joseph to be crowned King at Prague delighted his closing years, since he could not foresee that it would never be fulfilled. But his loyalty to the dynasty was strictly conditional, and his no less famous utterance, "An Austria which oppresses the Slavs has lost its right to exist; before Austria was, Bohemia existed; after Austria, Bohemia will be," was often to be quoted when the proud Empire of the Hapsburgs was stricken to the earth.

VI

The Union of Ireland and England was a war measure essential to victory in Pitt's judgment in the great struggle against France, but possessing no moral validity in the eyes of the Irish people. The Grattan Parliament, though consisting exclusively of Protestants embodied and expressed the ardent patriotism of a

gifted people; and Emmet's rebellion in 1803 showed that the Act of 1800 was a settlement by compulsion, not consent, a union of institutions, not of hearts. It was Pitt's misfortune that he was prevented by George III from granting Catholic Emancipation at the same time that he abolished the Legislature in Dublin. For almost a generation Ireland lay bruised and helpless; but in the second quarter of the century two movements were to show that the spirit of the nation was not dead, but sleeping. Grattan declared that the best advice he could give his fellow-citizens upon every occasion was to keep knocking at the Union; and in following his counsel the Irish people have employed every method from argument to insurrection.

Daniel O'Connell made his first public speech in 1800 at the age of twenty-five in a meeting of Catholics in Dublin to protest against the Union; and in 1823 he founded a Catholic Association, which raised "Catholic rent" for political propaganda. Though Catholics were excluded from Parliament there was no law forbidding them to stand; and when the member for Clare, on accepting a ministerial post, sought re-election, O'Connell won an easy victory. Wisely refraining from presenting himself at Westminster he remained in Ireland, holding meetings and mobilising public opinion. The Wellington Cabinet bent to the storm, and the King's Speech of 1829 announced a bill for the removal of Catholic disabilities, which was passed by a large majority in the early weeks of the session. A resounding though bloodless victory had been scored by the efforts of a single man.

The triumph of his first campaign emboldened

O'Connell to embark on a more arduous adventure. On the night that emancipation was voted a friend exclaimed "Othello's occupation's gone." "Gone!" was the reply. "Is there not a repeal of the Union?" It was not an afterthought; for on the eve of his triumph he declared that to obtain repeal he would give up emancipation itself. The movement was inaugurated when at the General Election of 1831 forty members were returned to support the demand. He brought repeal before the House in 1834; but with the sympathetic Drummond as Under-Secretary he declared that he would give the Union another chance. In 1840 the leader threw his whole energies into the struggle against "that odious and abominable measure," and founded the Repeal Association. He foretold that the Act of Union would be repealed in 1841, and monster meetings listened to the magic tones of the great Tribune. In 1843 he opened a debate in the Dublin Corporation, which decided to petition for repeal. He had always denounced the use of force in support of national aims; and when the Government forbade the assembling of a mass meeting at Clontarf, near Dublin, he loyally obeyed the order and avoided the shedding of blood. He was prosecuted and sentenced to two years' imprisonment, the people obeying his commands to remain tranquil; but though he was released after a few months, he was now an old and broken man, and his self-confidence was gone. The Government had declined to yield, and he refused to appeal to force. The state of the country filled him with dark foreboding, and in 1846 the Great Famine began to cast its shadow over the land. In 1847 he left Ireland to settle in Rome,

but died on the way in Genoa, leaving to his countrymen the memory of a stainless and self-sacrificing patriotism.

When the Repeal movement collapsed with O'Connell's surrender, the leadership of Irish nationalism passed into the hands of a group of young men whose patriotism was equal to that of the Liberator, but whose training and temperament beckoned along other paths. While O'Connell's achievement was to win full political rights for his fellow-Catholics, "Young Ireland" laboured at the political education of the country. The leading spirits were a young Protestant barrister, Thomas Davis, poet, journalist and historian, Gavan Duffy, and John Blake Dillon. Duffy suggested to his friends the foundation of a weekly journal; and the prospectus of *The Nation*, which began to appear in 1842, announced that its object was to direct the popular mind and the sympathies of educated men of all parties to the great end of nationality. The movement was scarcely less literary than political, and it was from the patriotic poems of Davis and the articles of *The Nation* that many of its readers learned to take an intelligent interest in the history, literature and antiquities of their country.

Duffy, who was at once proprietor and editor, gathered round him a brilliant staff, and the paper combined ardent patriotism with solid instruction. The campaign of enlightenment included cheap publications. A collection of the songs and ballads published during the first three months, entitled *The Spirit of the Nation*, was sold for sixpence. The speeches of Curran were edited by Davis with a biography of the great advocate. Duffy produced "The Library of Ireland," a series of shilling volumes of biography, poetry and

criticism. For the first time the nation was invited to drink deep at the wells of its spiritual life, to realise its historic heritage, to rise above its ecclesiastical divisions to a consciousness of its unity and a confidence in its future. The response was immediate; but the death of Davis in 1845 at the age of thirty was an irreparable loss. Moreover, while the programme of enlightenment appealed to all schools of nationalism, acute differences of opinion emerged as to the method of obtaining self-government.

Such an educational crusade was complementary, not antagonistic to the work of O'Connell; but when the Liberator in 1846 declared unconditionally against the use of force, the eager young nationalists, though they had no intention of employing it, formed a new association called "The Irish Confederation," differing from the Repeal Association by its theoretical acceptance of force. The cleavage was deepened by the adhesion of Smith O'Brien, a member of Parliament of resolute character, and later by James Lalor, who wrote incendiary articles in *The Nation*, till they were stopped by the editor. "Young Ireland" now broke in two, John Mitchel, the assistant editor, rallying to the standard of Lalor and founding a new journal, *The United Irishman*, in which he called on the people to "sweep the island clear of the English name and nation." When 1848, the Year of Revolutions, dawned, such incitements to revolt could no longer be tolerated. *The Nation* was suppressed, Mitchel was sentenced to fourteen years' transportation, and after half-hearted and ineffectual attempts at a rising the Young Ireland

leaders were arrested. Smith O'Brien and Meagher, after being sentenced to death, were transported. Gavan Duffy was tried; but the prosecution was abandoned and he lived to make a career in Victoria and to write in old age the romantic history of "Young Ireland."

Chapter III

THE UNIFICATION OF ITALY AND GERMANY

I

Italian nationalism dates from Napoleon, who in 1805 crowned himself King of Italy in Milan cathedral with the iron crown of the Lombard kings. He did not indeed bring independence; but for the first time the inhabitants of the peninsula realised that they were a nation. On the fall of the Empire, Metternich became the master of Italy; for in addition to governing Lombardy and Venetia directly, Austrian princes ruled in Modena, Parma and Tuscany, Austrian garrisons held Ferrara and other cities in the North, and Ferdinand of Naples, who had been restored to his throne by Austrian troops, bound himself not to introduce methods of government differing from those employed in Austria's Italian possessions. The King of Piedmont, the only native ruler in the peninsula, though disliking the Austrians, shared their reactionary views in Church and State.

Such a régime was bound either to paralyse the nation or to drive it to revolt; and the ominous rumbling of subterranean forces soon made itself heard. Secret societies sprang up, chief among them the Carbonari, who aimed at the expulsion of foreign rulers and the establishment of constitutional government. The first overt act of rebellion occurred in 1820, when a military revolt forced the King of Naples to grant a constitution;

but the autocracy was promptly restored by Austrian troops. In 1821 a similar revolt took place in Piedmont, and once more the constitutional movement was suppressed by Austrian forces. Minor plots in Lombardy and Venetia were ruthlessly punished by Austria, and the poignant record of the imprisonment of the poet Silvio Pellico aroused the sympathy of the world. The protests of 1820-1 were repeated ten years later when the expulsion of the Bourbons from France encouraged the Carbonari to try again. The Papal rule was overthrown in Romagna, a demand for a constitution in Parma forced Marie Louise to abdicate, and a rising occurred in Modena. But once more the Austrians intervened, and the leaders were executed.

In 1831, while the fortunes of Italian liberty were at their lowest ebb, Mazzini, a young Genoese, wrote to Charles Albert on his accession to the throne of Piedmont, passionately exhorting him to head the movement for expelling the foreigner and uniting Italy. The only reply was a prohibition to enter the territory; and Mazzini, who had lost faith in Carbonarism, now founded a society called Young Italy among the refugees at Marseilles. The liberation of the country, he taught, could only be secured by the united efforts of all its parts; but two raids into Piedmont in the hope of seducing the army failed, and the Bandiera brothers, who were members of the society, were captured and shot when they landed in Calabria in 1844. During these dark years the writings of Mazzini and Gioberti, Cesare Balbo and Massimo d'Azeglio encouraged their countrymen by reminding them of their past prowess and by holding out the prospect of a united or

federated Italy free from the dead hand of the Austrian oppressor.

A more hopeful era appeared to dawn with the election in 1846 of Pope Pius IX., who enjoyed the reputation of a Liberal bishop, and whose amnesty for political offences and other mild reforms made him for the moment a national hero. But greater events were soon to come. In the opening days of January, 1848, revolts broke out at Palermo and Naples; and the King, unable to obtain Austrian troops owing to the refusal of the Pope to allow them to pass through his territory, granted a constitution. The triumph in the South was repeated in the North. In March, the King of Piedmont granted a constitution, and the first Constitutional Ministry was formed by Cesare Balbo. A few days later the Grand Duke of Tuscany followed suit, and the flame spread to the Austrian provinces. After a sanguinary struggle Radetzky was driven out of Milan by the citizens, and in Venice a republic was proclaimed by Manin. The rulers of Parma and Modena fled from their capitals, and provisional governments declared for annexation to Piedmont. In Rome the Pope granted a new constitution, and pronounced a blessing on "Italy," a term which had been defined by Metternich as "a geographical expression." A declaration of war against Austria by Charles Albert on March 23rd was followed by some trifling successes; but the expected help from Rome and Naples was not forthcoming, and Radetzky, strengthened by re-inforcements, defeated the Piedmontese army, re-entered Milan, and concluded an armistice by which Piedmont agreed to evacuate the Austrian dominions. Manin was besieged in Venice,

and when Rossi, the head of the Ministry in Rome, was murdered, the Pope sought refuge in the Kingdom of Naples, and declined to return.

The bright dawn had been quickly overcast; for Italy's rulers were divided, and Austria was as strong as ever. But the struggle was not yet over. Early in 1849 a Constituent Assembly in Rome proclaimed a republic, with Mazzini as head of the Triumvirate; and at the same moment a republic was proclaimed in Tuscany, and the Grand Duke fled to Naples. In March Charles Albert renewed the war against Austria, but was at once defeated by Radetzky at Novara and abdicated in favour of his son Victor Emanuel. With Piedmont out of the fight the national movement was doomed. After a heroic defence of Rome by Garibaldi, the city was captured by a French army sent to restore the Pope, and Venice was recaptured by the Austrians.

The year of revolutions ended with Austria once more impregnably entrenched in the peninsula, her tools restored to their thrones, and the Pope converted from liberalism. But it left behind memories of dazzling heroism, and the blood of the martyrs was the seed of the nation. Moreover, Piedmont had revealed itself as the natural leader, and the new King's desire to free Italy from the Austrian yoke was an open secret. Best of all Cavour, who had guided public opinion throughout the crises from his editorial chair and from his place in Parliament, entered the Ministry in 1850 and became Prime Minister in 1852. His task was to reform the finances, to prepare Parliament for the next attempt to expel Austria, to discourage local risings, and to win the sympathy of France and England for the cause of

Italian unity. To achieve the latter, though Piedmont had no quarrel with Russia, fifteen thousand troops joined the Allies in the Crimea, and Cavour brought the Italian question before the Powers at the Congress of Paris which concluded the war. Great Britain, though not her sovereign, was friendly to the Italian cause, and Gladstone's attack on Bourbon rule in Naples as "the negation of God erected into a system of government" echoed over Europe. Louis Napoleon, again, had shared in the Carbonari rising of 1831, and his sympathy with Italian ideals survived the attempt on his life in January, 1858. Orsini's letter before his execution, exhorting the Emperor to intervene in Italy, and threatening him with death if he refused, bore fruit in a secret meeting with Cavour in July, when a French army of two hundred thousand was promised for the expulsion of the Austrians, whose Italian territory was to pass to Piedmont, while France was to be rewarded by Savoy and possibly Nice.

The failures of 1848-9 had proved that Austria could not be expelled by the unaided efforts of Italy; but now that the strong arm of France was secured there was no need to wait. On January 1st, 1859, the Emperor remarked to the Austrian Ambassador at the New Year's reception that he regretted that the relations of France and Austria were not so good as they had been. A few days later Victor Emanuel informed his Parliament that he could not remain deaf to the cry of pain which reached his ears from other parts of Italy; and at the end of April Cavour manœuvred Austria into a declaration of war. The Austrians were defeated at Magenta and Solferino; but at this moment Louis

Napoleon, without consulting his ally, arranged an armistice with Francis Joseph. The losses had been severe, the Austrian fortresses were strongly defended, and the war was far from popular in France. Moreover he feared the intervention of Prussia, and he had no desire to create an Italian state strong enough to threaten the Temporal Power. The infuriated Minister implored his master to continue the war alone; but the King wisely recognised that it was better to pocket Lombardy than to stake everything on the struggle for Venetia. The Emperor agreed that Lombardy should be ceded to Piedmont, a milder régime introduced in Venetia, the rulers of Tuscany, Parma and Modena restored, the Papal States reformed, and the Pope made President of an Italian Confederation.

With the exception of the transfer of Lombardy the political map was unchanged; yet the realisation of the national ideal was less distant than it appeared. Piedmont had invited Tuscany to join in the war, and when the Grand Duke refused Florence rose, its ruler fled, a Provisional Government was formed under Ricasoli, and Victor Emanuel accepted the protectorship of the country. A Provisional Government was formed in Modena, whose Duke had joined the Austrian army, and Parma proclaimed its annexation to Piedmont. Bologna raised the standard of revolt for Romagna and the Marches, and a Royal Commissioner was sent to take control. Cavour, who continued to pull the strings from his retirement, secretly encouraged Ricasoli and the other friends of union to hold what they had won; and in January, 1860, he resumed office, securing by the cession of Savoy and Nice the Emperor's consent

to the annexation of central Italy. Members from the new provinces took their place in the Parliament at Turin in April; and a month later Garibaldi embarked with his Thousand from Quarto, near Genoa, on two steamers and in three weeks entered Palermo. By the end of July Sicily was in his power. In August he crossed to the mainland and in September he entered Naples without striking a blow. Fearing that an attack on the Papal States would bring France on the scene, and failing to convince Garibaldi of the danger, Cavour determined to anticipate him. Piedmontese troops defeated the Papal army at Castelfidardo, conquered Umbria and the Marches, and joined Garibaldi's forces; and in November Victor Emanuel and Garibaldi entered Naples together. Gaeta held out till February, 1861, when the first Italian Parliament met at Turin, and Victor Emanuel was proclaimed King of Italy. The new state included the whole peninsula except Venetia and Rome.

The more difficult part of the work of unification had been accomplished when Cavour died in June, 1861; and all the world knew that another attempt to expel Austria would be made as soon as a favourable opportunity occurred. The moment came in 1866, when Bismarck, in view of the forthcoming struggle with Austria, concluded an alliance with Italy, whose reward was to be Venetia. Though Italy was defeated on land at Custozza and by sea off the island of Lissa, Prussia's overwhelming victory at Königgratz won the war. It was now necessary to wait for Rome, as it had been necessary to wait for Venice. Garibaldi had attempted a raid on Rome in 1862, when he was wounded and taken

prisoner by Victor Emanuel in a skirmish at Aspromonte; and in 1867 he renewed his attempt, but was defeated by French and Papal troops at Mentana. The hour for which cooler heads had waited struck in 1870. When Napoleon's power collapsed at Sedan, the Italian troops broke through the walls, which were only defended by a show of force; and in 1872 the capital was transferred to the Eternal City.

The unification of Italy had been carried out by Cavour, Garibaldi and Victor Emanuel, with assistance from Napoleon III and Bismarck; but the gospel of Italian nationality had been proclaimed by Mazzini to his countrymen and to the world before any one of these actors appeared on the stage. No country which won its liberty during the nineteenth century possessed so noble a prophet as its spiritual father. Interpreting nationality as a spiritual conception, he refused to consider it as an end in itself. His doctrine of duty, of service to humanity, was extended from the individual to the state. "Nationality is sacred to me," he wrote, "because I see in it the instrument of labour for the well-being and progress of all men. Countries are the workshops of humanity. A nation's life is not her own, but a force and a function in the universal scheme of Providence. Humanity is a great army, marching to the conquest of unknown lands, against enemies both strong and cunning. The peoples are its corps, each with its special operation to carry out." Looking round Europe he saw great empires—Russia, Austria and Turkey—created or held together by force, filled with human beings desiring to escape from their yoke and to live under rulers of their choice. The map of Europe, he taught, would have to be

remodelled, and states made as far as possible conterminous with nationalities.

Mazzini fully realised that race was not an essential ingredient of nationality. He frankly declared that there was not a spot in Europe inhabited by unmixed blood. Living in Italy, with her clearly marked natural frontiers, he laid great stress on geographical determination; and the spiritual heir of Dante was well aware of the unifying influence of literature and language. But he proclaimed that the basis of nationality was the popular will; and in preaching this doctrine he became the founder of the theory of nationality in its purest form. At this point most nationalists stop; but Mazzini proceeds to issue orders for the conduct of its citizens. Patriotism, like religion, must be revealed in its fruits. "Let country be incarnated in each one of you; let each of you so act that in yourselves men may respect and love your country. Flattery will never save a country, the honour of which depends much more on removing its faults than of boasting of its qualities."

Believing in "God and the People"—the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man—Mazzini saw Europe standing above the separate Powers as the Italy of his dreams stood above Piedmont and Lombardy, Venetia and Tuscany, the Papal States and the Kingdom of Naples. No country could hold aloof, whether on the material or the spiritual plane, without impoverishment. "There exists in Europe a harmony of needs and wishes, a common thought, a universal mind, which directs the nations by convergent paths to the same goal. A nation's growth depends on the trust that other peoples place in it. I hate the monopolist, usurping nation, that sees its

own strength and greatness only in the weakness and poverty of others. No country can outrage liberty abroad without nemesis." The duty of one nation to another, however, is not summed up in abstinence from aggression. Non-intervention in the domestic affairs of another would only be defensible if Europe consisted of contented national states; and even then it would be a selfish creed. Human solidarity demanded that good causes such as national independence and free institutions should be supported and evil principles attacked by men of good will wherever they were found, if necessary at the cost of war. There would be no lasting peace till Russia, Austria and Turkey released their hold on the nationalities within their borders. And in the fulness of time out of the mosaic of states would emerge " the United States of Europe, the republican alliance of the peoples, that great European federation whose task it is to unite in one association all the political families of the old world."

Mazzini's doctrine of nationality was ennobled by his faith in democracy and irradiated by his unshakeable belief in Providence. Like all Liberal idealists he believed that man is born with his face towards the light, and that his better nature would have free play when every nation enjoyed liberty and independence. With our experience of the half-century that has elapsed since his death we may be tempted to qualify his optimism. But his example and his writings remain to remind later devotees of the nationalist faith that the greatest nationalist of the nineteenth century subordinated nationality to the moral law and harnessed it to the unselfish service of humanity.

II

The tide of national sentiment rose to a flood in North Germany during the Wars of Liberation; but when Napoleon was overthrown the country entered on a period of stagnation. The yoke of Metternich lay heavy on the land, and King Frederick William III of Prussia refused to fulfil his promise, given on the eve of the Waterloo campaign, to grant a constitution. Local explosions of discontent occurred at intervals, such as the Wartburg gathering of the Students' Unions, in 1817, and the revolts in Brunswick and Saxony in 1830. But they were expressions of a desire for constitutional liberty, not for national unity; and the demand for the unification of Germany under Prussian leadership was only voiced by isolated thinkers like Paul Pfizer of Wurttemberg. Such feeble consciousness of unity as existed between the members of the Deutscher Bund was mainly due to the spiritual treasures bequeathed to their countrymen by Goethe and Schiller, Lessing and Heine, Kant and Hegel, Bach and Beethoven.

The wave of revolution set in motion by the Paris mob in February, 1848, travelled swiftly eastwards, and inspired the best minds in Germany to work for the transformation of the anæmic and amorphous Bund into a firmly-knit, powerful and self-governing state. The men who gathered in St. Paul's Church at Frankfurt—professors, lawyers, journalists—were the cream of the Intellectuals; and no country could boast of a larger number of men of high character and distinction. But the problem they had to face, like that which confronted

Cavour and Garibaldi, was insoluble on peaceful lines, and the attempt to win unity and liberty by discussion was a tragic failure. The educated middle classes looked with envy on the constitutional liberties and vigorous national life of Victorian England, and the France of Louis Philippe; and the professors were almost to a man adherents of moderate liberalism. But the King of Prussia, like most of the other rulers of Germany, hated the conception of responsible government, and Austria was irrevocably resolved to maintain her position as the predominant partner in the Bund. As the movement for unity and liberty represented a single demand, so opposition to the one involved opposition to both.

The failure of the Frankfurt Parliament cleared the stage for Bismarck. As the result of the division of parties and the timidity of King Frederick William IV Austria had re-established her power; and though Metternich had gone his spirit lived on in Schwarzenberg and Bach. In the fifties the "geographical expressions" known as Germany and Italy found themselves in a similar predicament. Both were smarting under disappointment and humiliation. Neither country could call its soul its own till Austria was extruded; and, as she declined to go, it was necessary to expel her by force of arms. The unification of Italy in 1859-1860 was watched in Germany with an almost hungry desire for imitation. In the year after Cavour's death Bismarck was called to the post of Prime Minister of Prussia by King William I. The two greatest statesmen of the nineteenth century had to solve similar problems, and they solved them by

similar means. The war with Austria was engineered as skilfully by the one as the war with France by the other. "If we did for ourselves what we do for our country," confessed Cavour with revealing frankness, "what rascals we should be!" The makers of kingdoms and empires fight with different degrees of success, but they employ the same kind of weapons.

When Bismarck entered political life as a member of the United Diet of Prussia in 1847, the idea of a united Germany had not dawned on his vision, and his guiding principle during the constitutional struggle was to defend the authority of the Crown against the encroachments of democracy. But it was not long after his arrival at Frankfurt in 1851 as Prussian envoy to the Diet that his Prussian pride was outraged by the unchallenged domination of Austria; and before he was transferred to the embassy at St. Petersburg in 1859, he had mapped out the plan of campaign which he was shortly to put into operation. Germany, he realised, could never become a Great Power till she was mistress of her own destinies; and Prussia alone was strong enough to expel her rival and to take her place as the predominant partner in a close federation of German States. The unification of Germany, he declared shortly after assuming office, would be solved not by speeches and resolutions but by blood and iron; and within nine years the grim prophecy was fulfilled.

The first task of the new Prussian Government was to prepare the army for the struggle that lay before it; and when the Landtag, which regarded war with Austria as no more than a distant possibility, refused the necessary credits, the money was raised and spent without

Parliamentary sanction. While the constitutional struggle was at its height the death of the childless King of Denmark re-opened the Schleswig-Holstein question, which had already led to war in 1849. The obstinate refusal of Denmark to respect the autonomy of her German provinces led to the mobilisation of the armed strength of the Bund and the defeat of the Danes after a spirited resistance. Austria and Prussia, on whom the brunt of the war had fallen, repaid themselves by a provisional division of the spoil. Such an arrangement, however, contained within itself the germs of conflict, and during 1865 both Powers began to prepare for the decisive struggle. While Roon, the War Minister, perfected the Prussian army, it was Bismarck's task to secure that when the guns went off the European situation should be favourable to Prussian plans. Friendship with Russia was the key-stone of his foreign policy, and his active sympathy with the Tsardom during the Polish revolt of 1863 gave evidence of his good feeling. The support of Italy was purchased by the promise of Venetia. France alone caused anxiety. He had no desire to buy her neutrality if it could be had for nothing; but he was ready to discuss compensation if the Emperor assumed a threatening attitude. The anticipated opposition of the minor states of the Bund caused little apprehension; for their military forces were small, and they lacked unity of control.

In the summer of 1866 the storm burst. France and Russia stood aloof, Italy retained large Austrian forces south of the Alps, the minor German states were overwhelmed by a few swift blows, and the main Austrian army was defeated at Königgrätz. The Austrian

commander Benedek was a beaten man before the battle, for he knew nothing of the Bohemian terrain and vainly craved permission to decline the supreme command. If Moltke's genius won the battle, it was Bismarck who won the campaign by compelling his master to stop the war when he was dreaming of a triumphant entry into Vienna. The French Emperor would inevitably present a demand for compensation and might well attempt to enforce it. Austria was defeated but not crushed, and she had heavily defeated Italy by land and sea. The object of the war was to expel the Hapsburgs from the German Federation, and Francis Joseph was willing to accept the logic of the stricken field. By the wisest action of his life the great Minister sacrificed the shadow for the substance, signed peace without annexing an acre of Austrian soil, and thereby rendered possible the resumption of friendly relations which were to issue in the Dual Alliance thirteen years later.

Though Prussia took nothing from Austria but the trifling indemnity, she enforced a wholesale re-arrangement of the map of Germany. Schleswig-Holstein naturally passed into her sole keeping, while Hanover, Hesse-Cassel, and Frankfurt were annexed. The states of North and Central Germany were formed into a North German Confederation under Prussian leadership, and a Constitution was drawn up by Bismarck. Though the power of the purse was entrusted to the Reichstag, effective control rested with the Bundesrath and with the Chancellor. The King of Prussia became commander of the armies of the constituent states, and by a series of secret treaties the armies of Bavaria, Wurttemberg and Baden agreed to join the

forces of the North German Confederation in the event of war.

When Napoleon III instructed Benedetti, his Ambassador at Berlin, to discuss compensations and suggested that France might redress the balance by the absorption of Belgium, Bismarck declined to pay ransom. In 1867 a conflict on the fate of Luxemburg was avoided with difficulty, and both sides began to regard war in the near future as almost inevitable. But while Germany perfected her army, the Emperor made no serious effort to prepare the French army for a life and death struggle. On the other hand, he attempted to secure an ally in the Emperor Francis Joseph, who was still smarting under his defeat by Prussia. But Austria feared that a war of revenge against Prussia might bring in Russia on her flank; and an appeal to Victor Emanuel was equally fruitless.

Napoleon III displayed a levity when the crisis arose in 1870 which would have been indefensible had he possessed an invincible army or a powerful ally. The expulsion of Queen Isabella by her subjects in 1868 left the throne of Spain vacant; and after a brief experience of a Republic General Prim offered the crown to Prince Leopold of Hohenzollern, a member of the Catholic and South German branch of the family which had its seat at Sigmaringen on the Danube. When the offer was declined, Bismarck despatched an emissary to Madrid, without his master's knowledge, to procure a renewal of the offer. Prince Leopold was again invited and again, in view of the passionate hostility of France to a Hohenzollern ruler in Spain, refused. Here the crisis would have ended had Napoleon III been a statesman; but he

craved dramatic restoration of his waning prestige. Without the knowledge of Ollivier, his Prime Minister, he telegraphed a demand that King William should veto the acceptance of the Spanish throne by a member of his family if the offer was ever renewed. No Great Power could have been expected to concede such an impertinent demand; and the King, who had shown himself straightforward and conciliatory throughout the crisis, informed Benedetti that he had nothing to add to his previous communications. The incident at Ems was promptly reported in a telegram to Bismarck drawn up by the King's secretary Abeken; but the Chancellor, who was dining with Moltke and Roon when it arrived, instantly resolving to capitalise the Emperor's folly, abbreviated the telegram, which, in his own words, he transformed from an apology into a challenge. In its published form the telegram suggested that the King of Prussia had publicly affronted the French Ambassador; and on the following morning Napoleon III, after a council at St. Cloud, signed a declaration of war.

The campaign was hardly begun when it was decided. The Emperor surrendered with eighty thousand men after the battle of Sedan on September 4th, and on October 26th Metz was surrendered by Bazaine, who capitulated with 170,000 men. The German armies swept forward to the siege of Paris; and despite the efforts of Gambetta to turn the tide of victory by organising fresh armies in the West, the capital was starved into surrender in February, 1871. The challenge of the French Emperor had sent a thrill of patriotic emotion through Germany, and the South fought with no less determination than the North. While the siege of

Paris dragged its weary length through the winter months Bismarck negotiated for the entrance of the South German States into a resuscitated German Empire. Baden had long been eager to enter into partnership with the North, and Wurttemberg was not unwilling; but King Ludwig of Bavaria required a little coaxing. King William desired to end his days as King of Prussia; but the Crown Prince Frederick was an enthusiast for the restoration of the Empire. The Treaty of Frankfurt registered the results of the war, which included the cession of Alsace and half of Lorraine and an indemnity of two hundred millions.

Germany needed unity and liberty; but she received unity alone. Nothing was more natural, and yet nothing was more pitiful, than the stampede of the majority into the Government camp in 1866. The needle-gun at Sadowa destroyed not only the army of Benedek but the liberalism of Germany. The bourgeoisie turned National-Liberal; and when Sedan had confirmed Sadowa it required strong nerves to oppose the Man of Destiny. The transformation would have occurred in any other people that suddenly realised the dream of centuries and found itself, as the result of two great wars, the strongest Power in Europe. In millions of German hearts there was no other feeling than that of proud thankfulness that their country was at last a nation, and that the civil wars and foreign invasions from which it had suffered throughout history were at the end. It was not till some years had elapsed that it became clear that Germany, like Italy, had been "too quickly made," that her easy victories were working like a subtle poison in the blood, and that the idealistic

liberalism of 1848 was being overlaid by a debasing worship of power and riches. Keen-sighted and patriotic men like Mommsen openly lamented that the accession of material strength was accompanied by a decline in spiritual values.

If Mazzini shines forth as the inspired prophet of Italian nationalism, Treitschke, the Bismarck of the Chair, may stand for the cruder Teutonic variety. His poems, which he began to write at the age of nine, breathed a fervid patriotism, and his lectures at Leipsic and Freiburg, like his early essays, glorified the architects of German greatness. "We need an Emperor," he cried in his address on Fichte in 1863; "Austria cannot give us what we want, for she is neither free nor German." A still greater effect was produced by his oration on the jubilee of the battle of Leipsic. "One thing we still lack—the state. Ours is the only people which possesses no general legislation, which sends no representatives to the meetings of the Powers. No salvo salutes the German flag in a foreign port. Our country sails the sea without colours, like a pirate."

Treitschke demanded a Germany that should be not only one Empire but one State. Prussia, like Piedmont, was to swallow smaller states, who were the tools of Austria or France. Prussia, he declared, had done everything that was really great in Germany since 1648, and was herself the supreme political achievement of the German people. Only the Courts desired the continuance of the existing system, which reduced Germany to a geographical expression. He rejoiced in the annexation of Hanover and Hesse-Cassel, and regretted that Saxony was allowed to survive. On the outbreak of war in 1870

he wrote, " What a humiliation we have escaped ! Had not Bismarck so cleverly edited the telegram, the King would have given way again." His " Ode to the Black Eagle " was the best war-song of the year, and his pamphlet " What do we demand from France ? " eloquently stated the demand for Alsace-Lorraine. When his country was at length united he devoted his strength to his *History of Germany in the Nineteenth Century,* and to his lectures on Political Science, which proclaimed in strident tones that the State is Force.

Chapter IV

THE LIQUIDATION OF TURKEY

A few years after Germany had attained to her full stature, the Christian races of the Balkan peninsula revolted against their Turkish masters and, aided by the strong arm of Russia, won in whole or in part their emancipation from a cruel and degrading yoke.

I

It is an axiom of Roumanian patriots that their race is descended from the Roman colony planted by Trajan in distant Dacia. As a matter of fact the term "Roman" possessed a political, not an ethnic significance; for the armies of the Empire were derived from half the races of Europe. Yet the survival of a Latin tongue on the shores of the Black Sea has created a feeling of differentiation from the surrounding Slavs and linked the Roumanians to Italy and still more to France as co-heirs of Roman civilisation. For a thousand years after the legions were recalled the land was a constant prey to invaders; but in the thirteenth century, after the departure of the Tartar hordes, the principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia were founded by native rulers. Two centuries later the country was engulfed in the Turkish flood; but the Sultans were for the most part content with tribute, and Roumania never suffered from systematic denationalisation as most of the other

conquered Christian races. For a brief and brilliant interval at the end of the sixteenth century Michael the Brave, the national hero, after freeing the land from the Turkish yoke, succeeded in uniting not only the two Principalities but Transylvania under his sway; but after his murder in 1601 the Turks regained their hold, governing the country through nominated native rulers. With the eighteenth century a new system was introduced which lasted from 1716 to 1822, the Sultan ruling through pliable Greeks, known as Phanariots from the Phanar or light-house district of Constantinople where they resided. As each successive ruler paid heavily for his post, it was the Sultan's interest to change them at frequent intervals; and during the century of their sway their average tenure was three years. Government by rapacious Greeks was strongly resented by the Roumanians; and the Greek revolt of 1821 frightened the Sultan into nominating native rulers to both principalities.

No sooner had the Roumanians evicted the detested Phanariots than they were confronted with an attempt to Russify their country. Roumania lay on the high road from St. Petersburg and Moscow to Constantinople; and when the Tsar Nicholas dictated the Peace of Adrianople to the Sultan in 1829, he secured that the Hospodars should be elected for life, and that full internal autonomy should be conceded. These privileges were balanced by an article empowering Russia to maintain a garrison in the country till the Turkish indemnity was paid; and the occupation lasted six years. "The conquest of Wallachia and Moldavia is superfluous," wrote Nesselrode, "for Russia is already their master." Alien

rule produced its usual results. A society for the promotion of national literature was founded in 1826, and the first Roumanian newspaper appeared in 1829. More books were written and read, and the liberalising influence of France began to filter in. In 1848 the revolutionary ferment encouraged the people to throw off the Russian yoke, and a bloodless revolution in Bucharest broke out. But Nicholas could hardly be expected to tolerate revolution in a country which he regarded as a vassal; and a Russian army marched to Bucharest. Russia and Turkey concluded a convention limiting the reign of the Hospodars to seven years, and substituting nomination by the Sultan and the Tsar for election by the nobles.

The liberation of Roumania from Russia and Turkey was the most abiding and beneficent result of the Crimean War. The southern part of Bessarabia, which had been annexed by Russia in 1812, was disgorged, and the Danube was placed under a European Commission. France and England desired to unite the two Principalities into a single state as a barrier against Muscovite aggression; but the proposal was vetoed by Austria and Turkey. A compromise was reached by referring the decision to the people; and the elections in both Principalities resulted in an overwhelming majority for union. The Powers merely conceded a central committee for common affairs; but the diplomatists were circumvented by the people. In 1859 Moldavia and Wallachia both elected Alexander Couza as their ruler; and two years later the Sultan gave his consent. The new state, which was called Roumania, continued to pay tribute to the Sultan, from whom the prince

received his investiture. Couza was forced by his subjects to abdicate in 1866; and Prince Charles of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen was invited to succeed him.

"If you fail," remarked Bismarck on the eve of the Prince's departure, "you will at any rate store up some interesting reminiscences." But Prince Carol did not fail. After a decade spent in developing the resources of the country and creating an army, the opportunity for which he was waiting came with the outbreak of the Russo-Turkish war. In April, 1877 a secret convention authorising the passage of Russian troops through Roumanian territory provoked the Sultan to decree the deposition of the Prince and to order the bombardment of a Roumanian town by Turkish gunboats on the Danube. The Prince replied with a declaration of war; but Russia declined his proffered assistance as superfluous. When Plevna proved impregnable the Tsar begged for help, which was accorded on condition that the Prince should command the troops of both Powers before the fortress. Plevna fell at the end of the year after a heroic defence. Though Russia could not have won without Roumanian aid, the Tsar insisted on re-annexing the portion of Bessarabia that he had been obliged to surrender in 1856, compensating his allies with the Dobrudja—a district of little value, largely inhabited by Bulgarians, between the Danube and the Black Sea—which he took from Turkey. But the blow was softened by the recognition of Roumania as a sovereign state, after nearly five centuries of Turkish vassalage. Three years later, in 1881, the Prince assumed the royal title, his crown being made of Turkish cannon captured by his soldiers at Plevna.

II

Serbia, like Roumania, had won her autonomy before she entered the rank of sovereign states in 1878. While Roumanians point with pride to their Latin tongue, Serbians recall the glories of Stephen Dushan—warrior, statesman, lawgiver—whose dominions stretched from the Danube to the Gulf of Corinth, from the Adriatic to within sight of Adrianople. Bulgaria was a vassal, and the Byzantine Empire had shrunk into a petty principality. Master of the Balkan peninsula, Dushan resolved to expel the Emperor and become the defender of Constantinople against the infidel. In 1356 his vanguard reached the suburbs of Constantinople, and the feeble Emperor Palæologus was incapable of resistance. But at this moment the conqueror died of fever or poison, and the Serbian host promptly returned home. The memory of the national hero lived on to inspire his people during the centuries of subjection that lay before them; and when King Milan declared war on Bulgaria in 1885, the army marched to the frontier with shouts of "Dushan."

Serbian nationalism rests on historic tradition to a greater degree than that of any other country. When Stephen Dushan's strong hand was removed, his vast empire broke up as rapidly as it had been formed; and in 1389 the Turks overthrew the Serbian army at the battle of Kossovo, which decided the fate of the Balkan peninsula for five centuries. When victory was trembling in the balance the leader of one wing of the Serbian army, jealous of his sovereign, rode off the field. King Lazar perished in the fight, and the flower of

the aristocracy were cut to pieces. The events of this terrible day are graven on the memory of every Serb, and a cycle of epic lays has preserved and embroidered the treason of Vuk Brankovich, the death of King Lazar, and the murder of Sultan Amurath by a Serb patriot in the moment of victory. Serbia lingered on as a vassal state till 1459, when it was merged in the Turkish Empire. For the next three centuries and a half her history is a blank.

The awakening of Serbia from her long sleep dates from the declaration of war against Turkey by Austria and Russia in 1788. Serb volunteers joined the Imperial army, Belgrad fell, Bosnia was freed, Macedonia and Albania rose, and it seemed as if the hour of Serbia's resurrection was at hand. But the jealousies of the Powers, the death of Joseph II, and the outbreak of the French Revolution, brought the war of liberation to an end, and Serbia was restored to the Turks. In 1804 a massacre of Serbian leaders by the Janissaries prompted Kara George (Black George, so called from his dark hair) to raise the banner of revolt. The new leader, a prosperous pig-breeder, had served as a volunteer in the Austrian army, and when the war was over he had joined the brigands for a time in the mountains. Volunteers flocked to his standard, Belgrad was captured, and the yoke of the Janissaries, who had snapped their fingers at the Sultan, was broken. Kara George, well aware that his country could not stand alone, asked for nothing more than autonomy, including the substitution of Serbian for Turkish garrisons. The Sultan refused and war broke out. Kara George was victorious, and when Belgrad capitulated his followers revenged themselves

for the centuries of oppression by a wholesale massacre of its Turkish inhabitants. The Sultan refused to recognise the independence of his rebellious province, and in 1812, when Russia's attention was claimed by the Napoleonic invasion, Turkish armies swept over the land. Kara George lost his nerve and fled to Austria, and after a spirited struggle of eight years the nascent flame of Serbian liberty was extinguished.

The flight of Kara George and many of his supporters left Milosh Obrenovich the most influential man in the country. Beginning life as a farm-servant he had gained wealth, and distinguished himself in the war; but for the moment he bowed to the inevitable, and accepted a governorship from the Turks. In 1815, however, he revolted, and a fierce guerrilla war secured a few privileges, among them permission to bear arms. But the services of Milosh were tarnished in 1817, when Kara George was assassinated on his return to his native land. Thus began the terrible feud between Obrenovich and Karageorgevich which was to complicate and disgrace Serbian politics for nearly a century. Milosh now assumed the title of Prince of Serbia, and declared the title hereditary. Twelve years later the Treaty of Adrianople, dictated by Russia to Turkey, decreed that Serbia should be independent save for the payment of an annual tribute and the occupation of the frontier fortresses by Turkish garrisons. The dynasty was recognised by the Sultan in 1830.

Milosh was the second founder of modern Serbia; but success made him a despot, and he was forced by his subjects to abdicate in 1839. Three years later his son Michael followed his father across the frontier, and

Alexander, the son of Kara George, was called to the throne. The treaty of Paris registered a further diminution of the power of the suzerain by placing the rights and privileges of Serbia under the collective guarantee of the Powers, and by forbidding armed intervention without their consent. Two years later the Prince was compelled to resign, and the aged Milosh, who had been expelled in 1838, was recalled. On his death in 1860 his son Michael, who had been expelled in 1842, found himself again on the throne. In 1867 the Prince respectfully requested his suzerain to evacuate or demolish the fortresses still garrisoned by Turkish troops. The claim was supported by Austria and England, and granted by the Sultan. With the departure of the last Turkish soldier no material link except the tribute connected Serbia with Constantinople.

A year later the best ruler of modern Serbia was assassinated by partisans of the rival dynasty. The National Assembly wrathfully decreed the permanent exclusion of the Karageorgevich family from the throne, and elected Milan, a lad of fourteen and the cousin of the murdered prince. Serbian opinion insisted on joining the revolt of the Balkan peoples against Turkey in 1876; but the army proved no match for the Turks, and peace was made early in 1877, a Russian ultimatum saving the country from loss of territory and an indemnity. When Russia herself declared war, Serbia re-opened hostilities with better success. By the Treaty of San Stefano she obtained the district of Nish and secured Turkish recognition of her independence, which was confirmed by the Powers in the Treaty of Berlin. Four

years later Prince Milan following the example of Roumania, was proclaimed king.

III

When the Serbian kingdom collapsed on the fatal field of Kossovo in 1389, the survivors of the battle sought refuge on the Black Mountain—the beach, in Gladstone's words, on which all that remained from the wreck of Balkan freedom was cast up by the waves. The border of black silk on the crimson cap worn by the Montenegrins perpetuates the mourning. Though the Turkish flood from time to time broke over the crags, and Cetinje itself, founded in 1484 on the topmost plateau, was more than once plundered by the Turks, the country was never really conquered.

> "O smallest among peoples! rough rock-throne
> Of freedom! warriors beating back the swarm
> Of Turkish Islam for five hundred years,
> Great Tsernagora! never since thine own
> Black ridges drew the cloud and brake the storm
> Has breathed a race of mightier mountaineers."

Tennyson's pæan of 1877 was echoed by Gladstone in 1895. "In my deliberate opinion the traditions of Montenegro exceed in glory those of Marathon and Thermopylæ, and all the war-traditions of the world."

The independence of Montenegro was preserved not only by her crags and the heroism of her children, but by a peculiar system of government. When the last of the Crnoievich dynasty, the son and husband of Venetian ladies, resigned the crown in 1516, he confided the administration to the Bishop, whose selection was ratified by the people. The arrangement saved the country from

civil war between rival chieftains, and an ecclesiastic was unlikely to succumb to the temptation of entering the Mohammedan fold. The Prince-Bishop, himself elected, was assisted by an elected Civil Governor who undertook the defence of the country. After nearly two centuries of harmonious operation this system was strengthened by the introduction of the hereditary principle. As the Prince-Bishop was forbidden to marry, he was empowered to select his successor from his relatives, and from 1696 nephew succeeded uncle in unbroken line. The family selected for hereditary rule was that of Danilo Petrovich, whose fortunes are as closely associated with the history of the Black Mountain as those of the Hohenzollerns with Prussia. Turkish invasions continued throughout the eighteenth century; but the Montenegrins were adepts in guerrilla warfare, and the Turks discovered that small armies were defeated and large ones starved. The cession of Cattaro and the whole of Dalmatia to Austria in 1797 on the fall of the Venetian Republic was a cruel blow to the little state, which had always looked forward to gaining the harbour and the coast-line possessed by the Serb kingdom in the days of its glory.

In the nineteenth century the administration was further centralised by the abolition of the Civil Governor. The office, which had existed since 1516, had become hereditary in a noble family, and the dual control worked smoothly enough till 1832, when an ambitious civilian attempted to overthrow the Prince-Bishop. The plot was discovered, the traitor was banished, and the office was never filled up. A still greater constitutional change occurred in 1851, when Danilo II, on his accession

surrendered his ecclesiastical functions. Montenegro thus again became a secular state, and the crown was enabled to pass from father to son in direct succession. The change was sharply challenged by the Turks, who had never recognised Montenegrin independence; but the invaders were heavily defeated. At the Congress of Paris, though he had remained neutral in the Crimean war, Danilo demanded the recognition of Montenegrin independence by the Powers, an increase of territory to north and south, and the cession of Antivari. The Sultan offered a strip of Herzegovina and a civil list if he would recognise Turkish suzerainty; but though the Prince was tempted to swallow the bait public opinion rebelled. In 1858 a Turkish force of 7,000 men attacked from the north; but the army was almost annihilated at Grahovo, the Marathon of Montenegro, by Mirko, the brother of the Prince. Two years later, Danilo was murdered, and he was succeeded by his nephew Nicholas, in whose reign Montenegro was to secure its juridical independence.

Prince Nicholas, who ascended the throne in 1860 at the age of nineteen, was destined to rule his little principality for sixty years and to become one of the most celebrated of European rulers. As a patriotic poet and the author of historical dramas, no less than as lawgiver and warrior, he was the spokesman and shepherd of his people. The successful war of 1858 had borne no fruit; but the great uprising of the Balkans in 1875 provided a more favourable opportunity. The Prince had visited the Courts of Europe and had obtained money from Russia which he spent on the army. The main military objective in the war was to reach the

sea-coast, and Antivari and Dulcigno fell to his arms. The Treaty of San Stefano, dictated by his friend the Tsar, trebled the area of Montenegro; but the Treaty of Berlin diminished his gains to meet the objections of Austria. The Black Mountain finally emerged with its independence recognised by Turkey and with double the area which it possessed before the war. The cession of Antivari was resisted by its Albanian inhabitants; and the Powers therefore substituted Dulcigno, which, however, the Sultan only disgorged when Gladstone threatened him with the British fleet.

IV

While the Treaty of Berlin gave formal recognition to the virtual independence which Roumania, Serbia and Montenegro already enjoyed, a new and powerful state sprang into existence at a single bound. The history of the Balkan peninsula during the nineteenth century may be defined as the disentangling of Christians from Moslems and the differentiation of Christians from one another. As the Turkish flood receded, a few spires and towers began to appear above the waters. Greeks and Serbs and Roumanians were clearly distinguished by the middle of the century; but Kinglake rode through Bulgaria in the fifties without noticing the existence of Bulgarians.

The Bulgars, a branch of the Asiatic stock to which Turks, Magyars and Finns belong, crossed the Danube from South Russia in the seventh century; but though they were merged in the Slavonic ocean which surrounded them and their language was lost, they have

preserved the appearance and to some extent the characteristics of their ancestors. Though they never reached such a height as the Serbs under Stephen Dushan, a powerful Bulgarian Empire existed in the tenth and again in the thirteenth century. With the Turkish conquest of the Balkan peninsula darkness descended on the land, and the Bulgarian people were forgotten for five centuries. The signal of deliverance was sounded in 1870 when the Sultan, on the principle of *Divide et Impera*, created an Exarch as the spiritual head of the Bulgarians in the Turkish Empire. The Greek Patriarch, from whose intolerant sway the Bulgarians were thus at last removed, excommunicated the Exarch and his flock; but the ecclesiastical differentiation supplied a nucleus around which a nation could gather.

The revolt in Bosnia in 1875 excited and frightened the Turks; and the Bulgarians, anticipating an attack, rose in in revolt. Their masters savagely retaliated, and the Bulgarian atrocities, revealed by Edwin Pears, a young lawyer practising in Constantinople, and denounced by Gladstone, made the name of Bulgaria familiar to the world. Bulgarian volunteers fought in the Russian army, and the Treaty of San Stefano created a Bulgarian state embracing not only Bulgaria proper, but Thrace and Macedonia, excluding the two great cities of Adrianople and Salonika. Though Austria had remained neutral in the war, bribed by the promise of Bosnia and Herzegovina, she had no wish to see a new Power, created by and obedient to the Tsar, supreme in the Balkan peninsula; and, joining with Great Britain, which Disraeli's Russophobia had brought to the

verge of war, she compelled Russia to submit the Treaty of San Stefano to a Congress of the Powers at Berlin, on the reasonable ground that the Eastern Question had long been recognised as an European concern. While the Powers made but minor changes relating to the other Balkan states, the Bulgarian settlement was torn to shreds. The territory assigned to Bulgaria at San Stefano was divided into three parts — the district north of the Balkans, with a population of two millions, alone forming part of the new state; that to the south, known as Eastern Roumelia, with one million souls, receiving autonomy under the Sultan; while Macedonia was restored to Turkey, subject to the promise of reforms to be carried out by the Sultan under the supervision of the Powers. The boundaries drawn at San Stefano assuredly provided Russia with the machinery for dominating the Balkan peninsula and disappointed legitimate Greek and Serbian claims; but they secured the emancipation of a very large Christian population from the Turkish yoke. The Treaty of Berlin, on the other hand, less concerned for the welfare of the Balkan Christians than for the Balance of Power, condemned Macedonia to remain the cockpit of the peninsula and launched Bulgaria on her career with nearly half her people outside the fold.

Though Russia's plan of a Big Bulgaria had been frustrated, her influence over the young state was unchallengeable. The Tsar selected his nephew Alexander of Battenberg for her first ruler, dictated the policy of the Government, and controlled the army through Russian officers. The high-handed conduct of the Russians rapidly cooled the gratitude of the people

for their liberators, and the smouldering discontent chilled the affection of St. Petersburg. The Prince would never have dared to challenge the *status quo*; but his hand was forced in 1885 when the population of Eastern Roumelia, which had never received the institutions designed for it by the Treaty of Berlin, rose against the Sultan and annexed itself to Bulgaria. It was a critical moment in the life of the young state; for the Sultan could hardly fail to vindicate his authority, and Russia, no longer ruled by the warm-blooded Liberator, but by his son Alexander III, encouraged Turkey to reconquer her revolting province. But Stambuloff, the Bismarck of the Balkans, warning his master that if he did not advance to Philippopolis he must retire to Darmstadt, was ready to take risks. Happily for Bulgaria the change of ruler at St. Petersburg was balanced by a change of ruler in Downing Street; for the Turcophil Disraeli was dead, and Salisbury had emancipated himself from the influence of his old chief. Fortified by the unhesitating advice of the British Ambassador at Constantinople, Sir William White, the Prime Minister threw his shield over Bulgaria, and warned intruders off the course. If the foundation of the Bulgarian state was the work of Russia, the peaceful union of Eastern Roumelia with the motherland was rendered possible by the moral support of Great Britain.

Though the dread menace of a Turkish invasion had been removed, Bulgaria was by no means at the end of her troubles. The sudden increase of her territory filled Serbia with jealous rage, and King Milan promptly declared war. The Bulgarian army was caught at a

disadvantage, as the Russian officers were recalled by the angry Tsar; but to the surprise of the world the Serbians were routed at Slivnitza, and the march of the victors towards Belgrad was only checked by an ultimatum from Vienna. The displeasure of the Tsar was intensified by the victory of his rebellious nominee; and in 1886 Prince Alexander was kidnapped by Russian officers. The Prince quickly returned to his capital; but his nerve was gone, and he submissively telegraphed his readiness to abdicate. For several months the throne went begging, till Stambuloff, the President of the Assembly and head of the Regency, secured Ferdinand, fifth son of the Prince of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha and of Princess Clementine, a daughter of Louis Philippe. For a time the new ruler was recognised by none of the Powers; and the frowns of the Tsar determined Stambuloff to seek the friendship of Turkey. The methods of the great Minister, who was the real ruler of the country from 1886 till his fall in 1894, were rough and even brutal; but it was under his sway that Bulgaria emancipated herself from the stifling embrace of Russia and became mistress of her own destinies. Like other reactions, however, the pendulum swung too far. In 1894 Ferdinand felt himself strong enough to dismiss his Bismarck. In 1895 Stambuloff was murdered; and in 1896 official Russian recognition was purchased by the baptism of Prince Boris in the Orthodox faith. Ferdinand was now recognised by the Tsar and his Turkish suzerain, and the country made rapid progress under its unloved but gifted ruler.

Chapter V

BEFORE THE GREAT WAR

I

While the Balkan Christians were winning their emancipation, Ireland renewed her efforts to revive her national life. The years following the collapse of O'Connell, the famine, and the revolt of 1848 were among the saddest in modern Irish history; and it was in this soil of indifference and despair that Fenianism arose. The termination of the American civil war set free thousands of Irish soldiers, some of whom joined a secret organisation to secure the Independence of Ireland. James Stephens and most of the other leaders were arrested in 1863 before they had time to rebel; but in 1867 a body of Fenians assembled at Chester, with the apparent intention of seizing the castle and its military stores. Later in the same year a van conveying Fenian prisoners was attacked in Manchester, and the officer in charge was shot. Shortly afterwards an explosion occurred in Clerkenwell Prison, where some Fenians were confined. These outrages compelled British statesmen to study the causes of Irish discontent, and led directly to the disestablishment of the Irish Church and the Land Act of 1870.

In 1870 a meeting of men of all parties was held in a Dublin hotel to consider the state of the country and to concert measures for its improvement. A resolution,

"that the true remedy for the evils of Ireland is the establishment of an Irish parliament, with full control over our domestic affairs," was proposed by Isaac Butt, a Conservative, Protestant lawyer. That evening witnessed the birth of the Home Rule movement. "The Home Government Association of Ireland" was formed, and striking victories were won by Butt's candidates at by-elections. In 1873 a Conference was held at Dublin, at which the name was changed to the Home Rule League; and in the election of 1874 sixty Home Rulers were returned. The programme had been set forth in Butt's pamphlet "Irish Federation," published in 1870. It was neither necessary, possible or desirable, he argued, to repeal the Union. Ireland asked for a subordinate Parliament, which would give her all that was needed for the full development of her national life. "The most discontented, the most distracted, and the poorest country in Europe" asked for nothing which could not equally be granted to England and Scotland; and before long the United Kingdom would in all probability be transformed into a federation, its local affairs being transacted by subordinate Parliaments.

Butt's argument was conducted without a trace of hostility to England. His distaste for violence was as genuine as that of O'Connell, and he believed that a modification of the Union could be secured by a reasoned appeal to public opinion; but the predominant partner, busy with her own concerns, paid no attention to a movement which confined itself to peaceful propaganda. Moreover, Butt was no leader of men. He brought Home Rule before Parliament session after session in able

and moderate speeches; but the House treated him with polite contempt. It was the task of other men to transmute his academic demands into an irresistible movement.

The first chapter in the history of the revolt against the Union tells of O'Connell, the second of Young Ireland, the third of the Fenians, the fourth of Isaac Butt. The fifth opens in 1877 when Parnell, who had entered Parliament in 1875, seized the reigns of the Nationalist chariot. Though scarcely more than thirty years of age, a Protestant and a landlord, he quickly transformed a disorganised mob into a disciplined army. The failure of the harvest in 1879 and the foundation of the Land League by Michael Davitt reinforced the political movement with the pent-up indignation of the peasantry, while the systematic obstruction of business at Westminster by Biggar, Parnell and a few other importunate Nationalists compelled the most indifferent legislator to occupy himself with the Irish question. The creation of Rent Courts in 1881 failed to allay discontent, and a fierce struggle broke out between the Nationalists and the Executive. The Phœnix Park murders exasperated British opinion, while the imprisonment of their leaders infuriated Irish nationalism. The futility of incessant Coercion Acts was becoming obvious to both the historic parties. In 1884 Chamberlain began to advocate the creation of Irish Councils. In 1885 the Lord Lieutenant, Lord Carnarvon, had a secret interview with Parnell, and gave him such satisfactory assurances that the Irish vote was cast for Conservative candidates in the autumn election. His hopes were disappointed, for Carnarvon resigned, and

Salisbury declined Gladstone's offer of assistance in carrying through Parliament a measure of autonomy. At the close of the year it became known that the Liberal leader had adopted Home Rule.

Gladstone's first Home Rule Bill, introduced in 1886, was rejected in the House; for an influential fraction of Whigs and Liberals declined to follow their old chief, sympathising with the fears of Ulster and distrusting the character of the Nationalist leaders. The Liberal party was reconstructed on a Home Rule basis; but its task was complicated by the divorce proceedings against Parnell, which broke up the Nationalists into warring factions. The rejection of the second Home Rule Bill by the House of Lords in 1893 was in accordance with British opinion; and with the formation of a powerful Coalition Ministry the triumph of Irish self-government seemed indefinitely postponed. Yet the long delay was not without its compensations. State-aided land purchase terminated the warfare between landlord and tenant, while the creation of County Councils in 1898 prepared the people for wider responsibilities, and the Gaelic League revived the Irish language.

With the opening of the new century the serried Unionist phalanx began to show signs of breaking up. In 1901 the Chief Secretary, George Wyndham, invited Sir Antony Macdonnell, a Catholic and a Home Ruler, to work with him as a colleague rather than a subordinate; but their programme was wrecked by Sir Edward Carson. Lord Dudley bravely proclaimed that his experience as Lord Lieutenant had convinced him that Ireland must be governed by Irish ideas. In 1903 Lord Dunraven founded the Irish Reform Association to advocate the

establishment of a Financial Council and a Statutory Body for dealing with local affairs. The Irish Council Bill of 1907 was rejected by Nationalist opinion as inadequate; for the hope of full Home Rule had been revived by the great Liberal victory of 1906. The spectacular success of Campbell-Bannerman's grant of self-government to the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony exerted a profound effect on opinion throughout the British Empire. After the power of the House of Lords had been limited by the Parliament Act in 1911, the third Home Rule Bill was carried thrice through the House of Commons and reached the Statute-Book at the moment of the outbreak of the Great War. The long delay, however, had bred a natural impatience; and a growing number of young men had already begun to turn from constitutional nationalism to follow the banners of Sinn Fein.

II

If the fortunes of Irish nationalism attracted the attention of the Anglo-Saxon world, the struggles of the Boers to live their own life unhampered by British interference aroused sympathy in almost every country outside the British Empire. The Napoleonic wars had transferred Cape Colony from Holland to England; and after two decades of British rule a large number of Boers trekked northwards into the unexplored country and founded the Transvaal and Orange Free State, the independence of which was at last recognised by Great Britain in 1852 and 1854. It was a hazardous venture for a few thousand Boers, armed only with their rifles,

to march a thousand miles into the Dark Continent; and wars with the natives strained their strength and their finances to the uttermost.

By 1877 the difficulties of the Transvaal had become so great that Sir Theophilus Shepstone was sent to Pretoria with power to annex the Republic. The pretext was that the Boers were unable to cope with a native revolt, and that the safety of British settlers in Natal was endangered by the growth of the Zulu power; but the stealthy annexation of their country was bitterly resented by the burghers, who vainly petitioned the British Government for its reversal. Lord Carnarvon, the Colonial Secretary, dreamed of federating the South African Colonies, as he had helped to federate Canada; but he failed to realise the passionate attachment of the Boers to their rude independence. Gladstone, on the other hand, denounced the policy of annexation, and on his return to office in 1880, the Boers naturally expected that he would reverse it. He was, however, assured by the British officials on the spot that the Boers were becoming reconciled to the new order, and in an evil moment he decided to accept the situation. The Transvaal, which had given him time to carry out his own policy, now rose in revolt. The Prime Minister, realising that he had been grossly misinformed, at once determined to open negotiations, and refused to allow the repulse at Majuba Hill to interrupt them. The annexation was annulled, and the Transvaal Republic re-established, subject to the control of its foreign relations.

The Dutch and British races in South Africa might have lived in harmony but for the discovery of gold on the

Witwatersrand in 1886, and the mushroom growth of a great cosmopolitan city within forty miles of Pretoria. Fearing that the immigrants would swamp their national life, the Boers excluded the newcomers, whom they regarded as birds of passage, from any share in the political life, despite the fact that the revenue was mainly derived from their activities. Had the administration been reasonably efficient, the anomaly might perhaps have been tolerated; but the régime of President Kruger was corrupt and obstructive. In vain did Lord Loch, the High Commissioner, visit Pretoria in 1894 to warn the President that he must make concessions; and in vain did the more progressive Boers throughout South Africa urge the need of reforms. The tide was setting against Kruger, who barely held his own against Joubert in the Presidential election of 1893. But at the close of 1895 his position was rendered impregnable by the Jameson Raid, engineered jointly by the Outlanders and by Rhodes, and carried out by the mounted police of the Chartered Company. The raid was repulsed without difficulty; but the whole of South Africa was convulsed by racial passion. The Dutch realised that they must stand together, and Kruger was exalted into the symbol of national independence.

The Transvaal had been treacherously annexed in 1877 and treacherously attacked in 1895; and it was only common prudence to be prepared for further surprises. Large guns and ammunition were ordered from Europe, and in 1897 a military alliance was concluded with the Orange Free State. The mischief of the Raid was increased by the failure of the South Africa Committee,

which sat in London in 1897, to insist on the production of all the relevant documents, and by the refusal of the British Government to inflict any punishment on Rhodes. The Dutch believed that Chamberlain, the Colonial Secretary, had known of the conspiracy, and that the missing telegrams would have proved it.

The relation of the two races became steadily worse, and men in both camps began to talk of a war for the supremacy of South Africa. Kruger was more resolved than ever to keep the Outlanders at bay; and Chamberlain's assertion of suzerainty, in a form at variance with Lord Derby's concessions of 1884, strengthened his conviction that Great Britain was resolved to incorporate the Transvaal in the British Empire. "If I put the Outlander on the box," he argued, "how do I know that he will not drive my carriage into Queen Victoria's stables?" With the arrival of Sir Alfred Milner as High Commissioner in 1897 the situation became critical. A monster petition from the Outlanders early in 1899 extracted from Lord Salisbury's Ministry a promise of intervention. Kruger and Milner met at Bloemfontein; but as each distrusted the other they failed to reach a compromise. The discussion of the terms of naturalisation and franchise reform lasted through the summer, while both sides prepared for the coming struggle.

In September troops were dispatched from England to Capetown and from India to Durban, and on October 9th the Transvaal launched an ultimatum. The Orange Free State joined its ally; but, after scoring some successes in the opening months, the Boer forces fell back before superior numbers. The two Republics

were annexed in 1900 after the occupation of their capitals; but the Boers, knowing every inch of the vast territory and unencumbered by military impedimenta, maintained a guerrilla warfare under the leadership of Botha, De Wet and Delarey with a skill and courage that compelled the admiration of the world. Neither overwhelming numbers, nor the devastation of the country, nor the terrible mortality among the children in the Concentration Camps secured the unconditional surrender which the British Government was for long unwise enough to demand. But Kitchener had learned to respect his brave foes, and the Treaty of Vereeniging, signed in May, 1902, while registering the loss of their independence, granted terms which brave men could accept without humiliation.

The prolonged conflict turned a large part of South Africa into a desert. The Boer prisoners were brought back from India and St. Helena, and assisted by grants and loans; but the process of reconstruction was slow. A new hope arose when the Liberal party returned to office at the end of 1905; and in 1906 full self-government was granted to the conquered republics. The courageous generosity of the act struck the imagination of the world; and the conviction of Campbell-Bannerman that self-government alone could heal the wounds of war was justified by events. The Transvaal elections made General Botha Premier with a composite Cabinet. But the interest of the four self-governing colonies touched at many points; and in 1908 a Convention framed a constitution which was embodied in a Statute by the British Parliament in 1909.

III

The struggles of subordinate nationalities usually appeal to the sympathies of the outside world; but in no case has there been such a unanimous response as that provoked by the efforts of the Finns to defend their liberties. On the conquest of Finland in 1809, Alexander I solemnly guaranteed the constitutional rights enjoyed under Swedish rule. These promises were confirmed by his successors; and while Russia was sunk in ignorance and poverty, the Grand Duchy presented a spectacle of liberty, culture and prosperity. For a generation after the conquest the Swedes remained predominant; for wealth and prosperity were in their hands, and they possessed a monopoly of education. The birth of Finnish nationalism may be dated from 1835, when Lönnrot published the "Kalevala," a collection of folk songs gathered from the lips of the villagers. Finnish became a literary language, and the linguistic movement remained for two generations the symbol of national advance. Finnish books and newspapers made their appearance, and educated Finns discarded Swedish for their own tongue. Official recognition by the Russian Government followed. In 1863 Finnish was permitted in the Diet and Courts; in 1886 in official correspondence; in 1894 in the Senate.

When the native culture had emancipated itself from Swedish domination, the Grand Duchy was summoned to a far more arduous struggle. Finland was governed by the Tsar as Grand Duke, by a Russian Governor-General, by a Finnish Secretary at St. Petersburg, by a nominated Senate, and by a Diet of

four Estates,—the nobles, the clergy, the burghers and the peasants. Effective Home Rule was enjoyed; the conditions of military service were light; and the army remained within the frontiers. Finland was content with her lot; but to the fanatical champions of Russification who came into power after the death of Alexander II the semi-independent little Duchy almost at the gates of the capital was an offence. "One law, one church, one tongue" was the ideal of Alexander III and of his tutor Pobiedonostseff, the Procurator of the Holy Synod; and the generals complained that Finland, while enjoying the protection of the Russian Empire, was escaping the burden of national defence. Towards the end of his reign encroachments began to be made; but the systematic attack on Finnish liberties was opened with the appointment of Bobrikoff as Governor-General in 1898. The Finns, while consenting to increase the army, rejected the proposal to merge it in the Russian legions; but the change was carried through by Kuropatkin, the Minister of War. It was decreed that Bills need only be submitted to the Diet if they concerned Finland alone. The postal system was amalgamated with that of Russia, the censorship was tightened, and the Russian language and police were introduced. These infractions were at first met by passive resistance; but in 1904 Bobrikoff, the symbol and agent of Russian repression, was assassinated.

An impressive protest by the most distinguished jurists of Europe produced no effect; but when revolution broke out in Russia in 1905, a national strike, engineered by the Socialists, secured the abolition of conscription, the restoration of autonomy, and the grant

of a democratic constitution with a Single Chamber, Woman Suffrage and Proportional Representation. The new Diet met in 1907; but by this time Stolypin was in the saddle, and it was dissolved in 1908. An ordinance transferred the control of all matters concerning the Russian Empire as a whole to the Russian Ministry, and abrogated the right of the Finnish Secretary to report to the Tsar. Finland could now only wait till her oppressor was once again in difficulties.

IV

No less vigorous was the resistance offered by the Poles to their Prussian taskmasters. Prussian policy had oscillated between repression and conciliation, but Bismarck's quarrel with the Catholics embittered him against the Poles. In 1886 a Land Commission was established at Posen to plant German settlers in Polish districts at the expense of the State. The campaign was costly and ineffective; for in some cases the Poles bought a second estate with the proceeds of the first, while in others they refused to sell to German bidders. The latter obstacle was removed in 1908 when the Government carried an Expropriation Act, empowering the Land Commission to buy what it needed at its own price. The policy was described by Prince Bülow as a measure of defence, necessitated by the fact that the Polish rabbits bred more rapidly than the German hares; and he expressed himself as satisfied if the number of German settlers was not diminished. Subsidised colonisation was not the only weapon in the

Prussian armoury ; but the attack on the Polish language was no more successful, and in 1906 popular resentment flared up. The children declined to answer questions in German, and finally refused to attend school. The Government punished and suppressed the school strikes by fines, expulsions and imprisonment ; but the result was to strengthen the determination of the Poles to defend the symbol of their nationality against all comers.

V

As Turkish misrule was the parent of nationalism in the Balkans, so the intervention of the Powers on behalf of the Christian subjects of the Sultan gave rise in turn to Ottoman nationalism. When the Young Turks rose against Abdul Hamid in 1908 they were hailed with enthusiasm as reformers. But though reform was on their programme, the mainspring of their movement was the resolve to strengthen the Turkish state against the encroachments of the Powers. When Great Britain's determination to secure decent government in Macedonia was re-affirmed in 1908 and the appointment of a Christian Governor foreshadowed, they realised that the province would slip from Turkish grasp unless decisive action was promptly taken. Operating from their headquarters at Salonika the Committee of Union and Progress had carried their propaganda far and wide at the risk of their lives before the Sultan heard of it. When the despot prepared to strike, part of the army in Macedonia mutinied, and the leaders proclaimed the Constitution of 1876. The panic-stricken Sultan yielded to the threat of a march on the capital ; the

warring races and religions joined in celebrating the downfall of their common enemy; and a Parliament modelled on Midhat's short-lived Assembly met at Constantinople.

It seemed for a moment as if a rejuvenated Turkey might take its place beside the young Christian states of the Balkans; but the honeymoon was brief. In October Prince Ferdinand of Bulgaria threw off the overlordship of Turkey, and Austria-Hungary proclaimed the formal incorporation of Bosnia and Herzegovina in the Hapsburg dominions. The Young Turks accepted a financial indemnity from both Powers; but their pride was deeply wounded and their prestige received a damaging blow. That Christian Powers took selfish advantage of the internal crisis strengthened the determination of the Committee to resist the tendencies to autonomy which had so often proved the road to separation. A new spirit of efficiency was introduced into the public services, and certain irritating features of the old régime, such as internal passports, were swept away; but these improvements were outweighed by an iron system of centralisation.

The Young Turks had made many enemies by their revolt and still more by their rule; and the Old Turks resented the domination of men who took little pains to conceal their contempt for the faith and precepts of Islam. In April, 1909 a revolution broke out in Constantinople, and the Young Turks fled for their lives. But the Macedonian troops remained loyal to the Committee, and within a fortnight Shevket Pasha fought his way into the capital. Abdul Hamid was deposed, and his brother was brought forth from his gilded cage to fill the throne.

The victory of the Young Turks was decisive; but the warning that would have led wiser men to modify their course was thrown away. The inhabitants of Macedonia were roughly disarmed, Albania was goaded into revolt, and the authors of a hideous massacre of Armenians remained unpunished. The brief reforming chapter was over, and the Young Turks set to work to create an armed and centralised Empire capable of playing a leading part in the politics of Europe.

In 1912 the Balkan States determined that the time had come to drive Turkey out of Macedonia and Thrace, if not out of Europe. Serbia and Bulgaria signed a treaty under Russian auspices arranging not only for military co-operation, but for the partition of Macedonia in the event of victory. Greece, which had been rescued from political anarchy by Venezelos, agreed to join in the attack but, like Montenegro, entered into no covenant as to the division of the liberated territory. To the amazement of the world Turkey collapsed before the impetuous onslaught, and was driven out of Macedonia and Thrace; but the victorious allies quarrelled over the spoils, and Bulgaria was compelled to sign the Treaty of Bucharest, which left her with a territory and population no greater than she had possessed before the war. But though all the other Balkan States emerged with extended frontiers, not one of them as yet embraced the whole territory to which it laid claim.

The expulsion of Turkey from Macedonia left Albania without a master. Scutari had fallen to Montenegro after a long siege; but King Nicholas was evicted by the Powers, as Serbia, who had occupied Durazzo, was compelled by Austrian and Italian threats to withdraw

from the Adriatic. The virile qualities of the Albanians had been praised by every traveller, and the highlanders had proved law-abiding citizens in Greece, where they had settled in large numbers. But though Turkish rule had been little more than nominal, they lacked the conditions necessary for an independent state; for a double line of cleavage ran through the country. A large part of the population at the time of the Turkish conquest had bartered their faith for the right to carry arms and other privileges. The Christians, in turn, are divided between Catholics in the North and Orthodox in the South. A still greater obstacle to unity is the system of clans, in which loyalty to the chief leaves little room for devotion to the fatherland. Add to these difficulties a poor and undeveloped country, without roads, railways or harbours, and with a population deliberately kept illiterate by the Turks, and we shall understand why the Powers made the new state a ward of the Powers under Prince Wilhelm of Wied. The Prince had just time to exhibit his unfitness for the post when the great war broke out and he fled from Durazzo.

Chapter VI

THE AWAKENING OF THE EAST

In the realm of ideas there are neither frontiers nor custom-houses; and during the latter part of the nineteenth century the principles of self-determination, which is the essence of nationalism, spread far beyond the confines of Europe. Throughout Asia two currents have been clearly visible. On the one hand there is a desire to imitate the West, to learn the secret of its power, to borrow its mechanical skill. On the other there is a deep-seated determination to retain and even to emphasise traditional ideals and characteristics. The awakening of the East has resulted from the appropriation of the ideas and methods of the West; but the most enduring result is the affirmation of its own personality.

I

The sensational development of national self-consciousness in Asia is mainly due to the emergence of Japan from her hermit life, when the arrival of Commodore Perry's American squadron in 1854 compelled her to open her doors. The last of the Shoguns resigned in 1867, the power of the Mikado was restored after an eclipse of more than two centuries, the Daimios surrendered their privileges, and the remains of feudalism were abolished by decree in 1871. A mission

to Europe, consisting of Ito and other open-eyed young nobles, brought back some of the exportable elements of civilisation. An efficient army and navy were created, compulsory education introduced, and the judicial system reformed. The first Parliament met at Tokio in 1890, and in 1894 Great Britain, by consenting to the abolition of ex-territorial rights, led the way in the recognition of Japan as a civilised state.

The birth of a Great Power in the Far East was proclaimed from the cannon's mouth in 1894. The weakness of Korea was a perpetual temptation to her neighbours; and Japan invited China to co-operate in demanding reform. When China declined, Japan peremptorily summoned Korea to accept a programme of reforms. Seoul was taken and the Emperor imprisoned, and when China intervened she was easily defeated on land and sea. The capture of Port Arthur compelled Li Hung Chang to sue for peace, and on the fall of Wei-hai-Wei the war was over. China ceded to Japan the Liao-Tung peninsula and the island of Formosa, and promised a large indemnity; but the ink of the treaty was hardly dry when Russia, France and Germany ordered the victor to disgorge the Liao-Tung peninsula, on the excuse that Port Arthur in foreign hands threatened the independence of Pekin. The resentment rose to boiling-point two years later when Russia herself seized the coveted stronghold.

The emergence of Japan as an efficient fighting machine, and the seizure of Port Arthur by Russia, rendered a conflict between the two aggressive empires almost inevitable. Prince Ito believed that an alliance with Russia was both possible and desirable; but the

majority of the Elder Statesmen favoured an alliance with the power which had first surrendered its claim to ex-territoriality, had stood aloof from the robber band in 1895, and had shared in the indignation aroused by the seizure of Port Arthur. The tightening grip of the Russian bear on North China after the Boxer revolt of 1900 caused the keenest apprehension to both Powers,—to Great Britain on account of her trade, to Japan on account of Korea. After long negotiations in London between the Japanese Ambassador and Lord Lansdowne, a treaty was signed in January, 1902. Though the name of Russia did not occur in the document, it was none the less a mutual insurance against her aggression. Japan's admission to partnership with a great European Power gave her a position which had never been attained by any Oriental State, and assured her that in the event of war with Russia her ally would keep the ring.

Russia's promise to evacuate Manchuria had not been fulfilled; and highly-placed speculators obtained a concession to cut timber on the banks of the Yalu, the river dividing Korea from Manchuria. In 1903 Japan suggested a treaty safeguarding her rival's interests in Manchuria and defining her own claims in Korea; but the Russian Government, neglecting the warnings of Witte, was in no mood for compromise. The conflict was opened in February, 1904, without a declaration of war by an attack on the Russian fleet at Port Arthur; and its course was watched by the whole world with amazement. Few expected Japan to display such perfect organisation and such irresistible bravery, and few were prepared for the blundering incompetence of

Russia. For the Japanese it was a national struggle for clearly defined objects, and the conflict ranged in part over ground familiar to her since 1894. Port Arthur was captured after a long siege, while the main Japanese army crossed the Yalu and in a series of battles drove the enemy beyond Mukden. The struggle was concluded on May 7th, 1905, when the Russian fleet on its way to Vladivostock was annihilated by Togo in the straits of Tsushima, between Korea and Japan. By the Treaty of Portsmouth Russia recognised the claims of Japan in Korea, ceded the Liao-Tung peninsula and the southern half of Sakhalin, and provided for the evacuation of Manchuria. The victory of Japan over Russia is the most important event in the modern history of Asia. The ringleader of the Powers which had been engaged in carving China into slices was overthrown in single combat, and the achievement thrilled Asia with a confidence and self-respect she had never known.

The solidarity and patriotic pride which enabled Japan to raise herself in a generation to an equality with the strongest and most civilised Powers of the Old and New World, had their roots deep down in the soil of national character and tradition; for, while eager to learn the secrets of the West, she jealously preserved her beliefs and principles. Nowhere in the modern world has such devotion to the dynasty been shown as in the land whose Imperial family has borne sway for twenty-five centuries in unbroken descent. Next to the cult of the Mikado, as a source of national inspiration, ranks the worship of ancestors. It was a revelation to the West when the heroes of the war of 1904-5 attributed their victories not to their own prowess and preparations,

but to the virtues of their Emperor and the spirits of their ancestors. The subordination of the individual to the community is the mark of the East; but nowhere is it carried to a greater height of romantic self-sacrifice than in the theory and practice of modern Japan.

II

The defeat of China by Japan in 1894 convinced the young Emperor that changes were needed in the oldest and most populous state in the world; and he lent a ready ear to the proposals of Kang Yu Wei for national education and the introduction of western ideas. The reform movement, however, was blighted from the start by the simultaneous encroachments of the European Powers. China was compelled to lease Kiao-chou to Germany, nominally in compensation for the murder of two missionaries; Russia obtained a lease of Port Arthur; and Great Britain, not to be outdone, acquired Wai-hei-Wai, and an extension of territory opposite Hong-Kong. France secured a concession near Tonkin; but when Italy asked for a bay the Government plucked up courage to refuse.

Foreign influence became anathema to the people, and a society called the Boxers, who claimed to be invulnerable, spread rapidly through the provinces, preaching death to foreigners. They were supported by the Dowager-Empress, Tzu Hsi, who resumed the Regency and annulled the reform decrees. Attacks on Europeans began in 1899 and became frequent in the early months of 1900. Pekin was surrounded by Boxer troops, and the Legations were closely besieged.

The destruction of the Taku forts, which had fired on the allied warships, was treated by China as a declaration of war. The Imperial troops now joined the Boxers, the German Ambassador was murdered in the streets of Pekin, and the European residents, who had taken refuge in the British Legation, were bombarded. The Legations were rescued after a terrible siege of two months. The allies insisted on the punishment of the ringleaders, the dismantling of the forts between Pekin and the coast, and the payment of large indemnities.

The victory of Japan over Russia in 1905 opened a new chapter in the history of China. The reactionary nationalism which had culminated in the Boxer rising gave place to enthusiasm for western learning and western methods. Decrees were issued condemning foot-binding, approving inter-marriage between Manchus and Chinese, abolishing literary examinations for official employment, and forbidding torture and mutilation. Railways were built, schools were opened, Japanese instructors were imported, and students flocked to foreign Universities. Provincial assemblies were established in 1909, a National Assembly, composed chiefly of officials and nominees, met at Pekin in 1910, and the Manchu dynasty was deposed in 1912. The first Parliament met in 1913, and, after a revolt in the south had been suppressed, elected Yuan Shi Kai as the first President of the Republic. Still more remarkable as an evidence of reforming zeal was the crusade against opium. Though the changes have been on the whole disappointing in their results, there could be no more doubt as to the abiding vitality of the race and for its desire for national self-determination.

III

If the mutiny may be regarded as the first explosion of Indian sentiment against the domination of an alien race, it was not till the closing decades of the nineteenth century that the intellectual *élite* of the different races and provinces of the vast peninsula began to be conscious of their unity. When English education was introduced, Macaulay, at any rate, was well aware whither it would lead. "If you supply them with education," he predicted, "you will create ambitions; and if you create ambitions, you must provide the means for their satisfaction." Never was a forecast more accurately fulfilled.

The idea of a Parliament first took shape in the brain of one of India's alien governors. Allan Hume had become convinced during the rule of Lord Lytton that some definite action was necessary to counteract the growth of unrest; and in 1883, after retiring from the public service, he summoned the Graduates of Calcutta University to lead a movement for reform. "In vain may aliens like myself love India and her children. We lack the essential of nationality, and the real work must ever be done by the people of the country themselves." He asked for fifty Founders, and obtained them from all parts of the country. The members of "The Indian National Union" were agreed "in holding the continued affiliation of India to Great Britain, at any rate for a period far exceeding the range of any practical political forecast, to be absolutely essential to the interests of our own national development." After a visit to England to consult proved friends of India, among them Lord

Ripon and John Bright, Hume returned to take part in the first annual session of the Indian National Congress at Bombay in December, 1885. The Congress asked for the admission of elected members to the Viceroy's and Local Legislative Councils, the discussion of Budgets by such enlarged Councils, the right to interpellate the Executive, and the creation of a Standing Committee of the House of Commons. Every one of the demands was ultimately to be conceded, and Hume declared that " the people of India was at last a nation." The sun seemed to be shining on his work; for Lord Dufferin told him that it would be a public benefit if the Government could be kept informed of the best Indian public opinion through some responsible organisation. At the second Congress, held in Calcutta, the Viceroy publicly displayed his sympathy by inviting the members to a garden party; and in 1888 a similar compliment was paid by the Governor of Madras.

Hume was grateful for, but not satisfied with, official smiles; and in 1888, obsessed by the misery of the masses, he determined to awaken the authorities to the urgency of the case by active propaganda. The Government, hitherto sympathetic, now drew back in alarm, and the Congress passed into opposition. The frowns of Simla encouraged the influence of the Left; but for twenty years the Congress followed the path of constitutional agitation which its founder had marked out for it. Its leaders,—Dadabhai Naoroji, for some years a Member of Parliament, Sir Pherozesha Mehta, Surendranath Banerjee, " the Gladstone of India," and above all Gokhale—were men of high character and statesmanlike vision, and in happier days were destined to

become the trusted advisers of the British Raj. The Mohammedan community stood aloof from the Congress till nearly a generation had passed.

The Indian Councils Act of 1892 increased the nominated Indian members of the Viceroy's and Provincial Councils and strengthened the non-official element; but no further advance was made towards meeting the Congress demands during the rule of Lord Elgin, whose attention was claimed by frontier wars and famine, or of Lord Curzon, who had little sympathy with the aspirations of educated Indians. With the return of the Liberal party to power in 1906 a new era opened. While a campaign of repression against the extreme Left was undertaken by Lord Minto, a far-reaching scheme of reform was being elaborated by the Secretary of State, Lord Morley. By the Councils Act of 1909 a large addition was made to the membership of the Viceroy's and Provincial Legislative Councils, an official majority being retained in the former alone, and special safeguards for the Mohammedan majority being inserted. The Executive Councils of Madras and Bombay were enlarged from two members to four, one to be an Indian, and Executive Councils were foreshadowed for the other provinces. Greater latitude was permitted in criticism and debate. Of even higher importance was the appointment of Sinha, the leading barrister of Calcutta, as Legal Member of the Viceroy's Executive Council, and of two Indians to the Council of the Secretary of State. Though the reforms failed to mollify the root and branch opponents of British rule, they fulfilled Lord Morley's precept, "Rally the Moderates," and opened up a fruitful field of co-operation between the bureau-

cracy and the leaders of public opinion. The national Congress had split at its meeting at Surat in 1907, the followers of Tilak parting company with the Gokhale moderates. That Lord Hardinge desired to work the new system in the spirit of its authors was shown by his cordial reception of Sir William Wedderburn as President of the National Congress, and his resolute championship of the rights of Indians in South Africa; while the cancelling of the worst features of Lord Curzon's partition of Bengal, announced by King George at his coronation at Delhi, which was restored to its historic position as the capital of India, revealed a desire to respect the sentiment of Indian nationality.

IV

At the beginning of the twentieth century Persia awoke from her long sleep. Muzaffer-ed-Din, who ascended the throne in 1890, was an amiable but effeminate ruler, squandering his country's resources in costly journeys to Europe and for the first time incurring a foreign debt. In 1891 a passionate outcry greeted the grant of a Tobacco Monopoly to an English company, and the concession was revoked at the cost of half a million. But in 1899 the custom houses were placed under the control of Belgian officials, and in 1900 and 1902 Russian loans were negotiated on onerous terms. The gradual mortgaging of the country to Russia was watched with jealousy by Great Britain, and with indignation by the long-suffering Persians; and in 1905 a number of merchants and mullahs took sanctuary in a mosque in protest against the Grand Vizier. When the Shah

promised to dismiss his adviser, the protesters returned; but the Minister remained. A second *Bast* took place in 1906, when about 14,000 indignant citizens took refuge in the grounds of the British Legation; but this time the demand was for a Parliament.

The Shah bent to the storm, and granted a constitution. Newspapers were issued, political clubs sprang into life, and a National Assembly met at Teheran. In the following year Muzaffer-ed-Din died, and was succeeded by his son Mohammed Ali, who had a bad record as Governor of Tabriz. The first Budget cut down pensions and sinecures, and turned the annual deficit into a surplus without fresh taxation. The reduction of the Civil List intensified the Shah's detestation of a meddling Parliament, and his Ministers' heads were only saved by the intervention of the British *chargé d'affaires*. In 1908 an attempt was made on his life, and he fled to his Summer Palace, whence he carried out a *coup d'état* with the aid of Colonel Liakoff and the "Cossack Brigade," a native force under the command of Russian officers. The Parliament House was bombarded, Liakhoff was appointed Military Governor of the Capital, and the reformers fled for their lives. The Constitutionalists held out in Tabriz during the winter, closely invested by the royalist forces. When the fall of the city was imminent, Russian troops crossed the frontier to its relief. About the same time the Baktiaris, a fighting tribe of the South, fought their way to the capital and compelled the Shah to abdicate. His youthful son was placed on the throne under a Regent educated at Balliol, the Parliament was recalled, and the work of reform resumed.

The expulsion of the treacherous autocrat facilitated the task of the reformers; but the Treasury was empty and the actors inexperienced. Accordingly in 1911, Mr. Shuster, an American of high character and ability selected by President Taft, was invited to assume control of the finances, and quickly gained the affectionate confidence of his employers. For a moment it seemed as if a new day might dawn for Persia; but Russia had no desire for a solvent and self-respecting Persia, which would resist political encroachments and economic penetration. The Anglo-Russian treaty of 1907 had terminated the antagonism of the two Powers; and Russian concessions in Afghanistan were balanced by British concessions in Persia. The Russian sphere embraced the north and centre, which included the richest and most populous districts and the three large cities of Tabriz, Teheran and Ispahan, the British being confined to the south and east. Each Power undertook to seek no political or commercial concessions in the other's sphere, though in the neutral zone both Powers might compete. The Treaty explicitly recognised Persia as an independent state; and the economic claims of the signatories in the respective spheres of influence carried with them no political rights.

Mr. Shuster considered himself the servant of the Persian Government by which he was appointed and paid; but he quickly discovered that the real obstacle to success lay not in Teheran but in St. Petersburg. "I was early offered the plain choice," he wrote in his poignant narrative, *The Strangling of Persia*," between serving the Persian people and only appearing to do so, while actually serving foreign interests bent on

Persia's national destruction." Collisions were inevitable, and, after eight months of uphill but fruitful effort, the Treasurer was chased out of the country by a Russian ultimatum which was approved by Sir Edward Grey. It may be freely admitted that Persia had long fallen from her high estate; that many members of the Constitutionalist party were selfish and some were corrupt; that Mr. Shuster might have paid more consideration to Russian susceptibilities, however much he despised her selfish aims. But it was an outrage that when Persia, after centuries of oppression, began to feel herself a nation and to struggle to her feet, she was hurled back by a Power which had solemnly recognised her independence. With Mr. Shuster's expulsion the country relapsed into anarchy, from which a Swedish gendarmerie was to make unavailing efforts to rescue it. Meanwhile Russian troops were entrenched in the north, which became in everything but name a province of the Russian Empire till the outbreak of the Great War. The collapse of Russia delivered Persia from her oppressor, and in 1919 an Anglo-Persian treaty committed her fortunes into the keeping of Great Britain.

V

Egypt belongs to the East by religion if not by geography; and the ferment of nationalism has been felt in the valley of the Nile no less than in India and Persia. The extravagance of the Khedive Ismail led to the establishment of the Dual Control of France and Great Britain, his principal creditors, and to his deposition by Abdul-Hamid in 1879. His son, Tewfik, was an

amiable mediocrity; the peasantry were in debt; the country was bankrupt, and alien creditors were in possession. No self-respecting Egyptian looked to Constantinople for deliverance; for the Sultan was merely waiting for a pretext to recover the authority which his predecessors had been compelled to delegate to the Albanian adventurer Mehemet Ali and his successors. Egypt was ripe for revolt against both Turkish and European domination.

Early in 1881 Arabi and two other Colonels were summoned before a court-martial for insubordination. They were rescued by their soldiers during the proceedings; and in September they obtained a change of Ministry and the summoning of the Chamber of Notables by a demonstration before the Khedive's palace. The movement had begun as a protest against the monopoly of the higher positions by Turks; and in April, 1882, forty Turkish officers were court-martialled by order of Arabi, now Minister of War, and exiled to the Sudan. The Khedive's refusal to sanction the sentence prompted the Cabinet to recall the Chamber of Notables in order to depose the Khedive. The Notables, however, fearing European intervention, declined to act; and the Cabinet resigned. The atmosphere was electric, and a spark might set it aflame.

Though the crisis arose from the antagonism of native to Turkish officers, the movement had broadened out into hostility to all foreigners. Great Britain and France had addressed a warning note to the Government in January; but no attention was paid to it, and in May the British and French fleets sailed to Alexandria to protect the lives and interests of Europeans. In June the mob

of Alexandria rose, pillaged and massacred; and in July the British Admiral bombarded the forts of the city, France having withdrawn at the last moment. Arabi and his friends took up the challenge and prepared to resist further attacks. The Sultan declined the invitation of the Powers to quell the revolt, fearing to send his troops against Mussulmans, who were resisting Christian aggression. The rebellion was suppressed by Wolseley's victory at Tel-el-Kebir, and the leaders were tried and condemned to death; but the sentence was commuted to banishment by the Khedive, acting on the advice of Lord Dufferin, who had been sent as High Commissioner to report and advise.

Our verdict on the rebellion will depend in some measure on our estimate of its leader. Was Arabi a selfish and ambitious intriguer, as destitute of political talent as of personal courage? Or shall we look at him through the spectacles of Mr. Wilfrid Blunt, the life-long champion of Egyptian nationalism, to whose efforts in securing the services of an English barrister and in mobilising British opinion was mainly due the preservation of his life? Whatever may be thought of the nationalist leader, the movement, as Lord Cromer frankly admitted, was "in its essence a genuine revolt against misgovernment." Egypt had good right to complain of Khedivial misgovernment, of the Turkish preferences of the Court, of the tutelage of foreign financiers. But the movement was marred by selfish and violent courses, and its result was to rivet the alien yoke on the country.

After the substitution of the British Occupation for the Dual Control Egyptian nationalism, paralysed by the

banishment of its leaders and the presence of a British garrison, slumbered for twenty years. In 1905, towards the end of Lord Cromer's long rule, a new generation arose, led by Mustapha Kamel, and approved by the Khedive Abbas II, who had never concealed his repugnance for the British occupation. An attack on some British officers while pigeon-shooting in the village of Denshawai, followed by public executions and floggings, revealed and increased the growing embitterment. Mustapha Kamel died in 1908 at the age of thirty-four, and left no unchallenged successor, while the Khedive's friendship with Sir Eldon Gorst deprived the nationalist opposition of official patronage. When Lord Kitchener reached Cairo in 1911 the country appeared to regain something of the tranquillity of Lord Cromer's middle years ; but a storm was brewing in Europe which was soon to plunge Egypt into the fiery cauldron of war.

Chapter VI

ARMAGEDDON

The Great War of 1914 is connected with the history and development of nationalism in several ways. Firstly, it was the result of the resolve of various nations, great and small, to realise their territorial and commercial ambitions, at whatever cost to the peace of the world. In the second place, the sufferings of Belgium and Serbia focussed attention on the fortunes, the dangers and the aspirations of small nations. Thirdly, the proclamation by a thousand voices that the Allies were fighting for the principle of self-determination awoke or encouraged dreams of independence. And finally, the collapse of four powerful Empires paved the way for the creation of new states and the consolidation of racial units.

I

The defeat of Germany naturally carried with it the recovery of the provinces lost by France in 1871. It was true that Alsace and Lorraine had formed a portion of the Holy Roman Empire for many centuries, that parts of them had been won by France by arms, and that Alsace was German by blood and language; but it was also true that a powerful sentiment of loyalty and attachment had grown up since the French Revolution, and that the thirty-six representatives in the French

Chamber registered a solemn protest against their forcible transfer. The rapid development of the mineral wealth by German brains and capital brought material prosperity; but the conquerors ruled with a heavy hand, and the attempt to stifle Francophil sentiments in the army, the schools and the administration produced the inevitable result of keeping them alive. What proportion of the population in 1919 desired to remain within the German Empire, to return to France, or to become an independent state will never be known, for France in her hour of victory declined a plebiscite as peremptorily as Germany had done in 1871.

A second result of the German *débâcle* was to enable Denmark to recover the portion of North Schleswig in which Danes form the majority. Schleswig and Holstein enjoyed autonomy under the Danish crown till, in the middle of the nineteenth century, the King endeavoured to incorporate them in a centralised state. The population, which was overwhelmingly German, turned to the Bund for assistance; and though the revolt of 1849 was a failure, that of 1864 was crowned with success. The Danes were defeated by Prussia and Austria, who proceeded to divide the spoils. By the Treaty of Prague in 1865 Prussia undertook to consult the inhabitants of North Schleswig whether they desired to rejoin Denmark; but in the following year Austria was expelled from the German Confederation, and in 1879 Prussia declared the obligation of 1865 to be cancelled. The iron uniformity of Hohenzollern rule produced no less resentment among the Danes of Schleswig than among the French of Lorraine; but not until every boundary in Europe was thrown into the

melting-pot in 1914, did the opportunity arise of restoring the 150,000 Danes of North Schleswig to the motherland. The Danish Government welcomed the principle of a plebiscite, the province being divided for the purpose into three zones; and while the northern territory naturally returned a majority for Denmark, the central or Flensborg area elected to remain German.

In addition to surrender of territory on the west and north, Germany has been compelled to disgorge almost the whole of the territory which fell to her in the partitions of Poland. The larger part of the provinces of Posen and West Prussia pass to the new Polish state, Danzig being placed under a High Commissioner responsible to the League of Nations, though forming part commercially of Poland. The fate of Eastern Silesia, which contains a Polish majority but formed no part of the Polish Kingdom, was referred by a plebiscite.

II

The overthrow of Russia has contributed to the realisation of national aspirations in a far larger degree than that of Germany; for not far short of half her population differed in blood, language or religion from the dominant type of Orthodox Slav. The sword has ploughed deep furrows in Eastern Europe, and we may watch the infant struggles of a litter of states, some already recognised, others clamouring for recognition.

On the outbreak of war the Russian Government, instead of winning the goodwill of Finland by the respect of her constitutional rights, continued her suicidal policy of denationalisation. When the Tsardom collapsed

Finland seized the opportunity to abolish the Senate and make the Diet supreme, while admitting the continuance of Russian control of the army and foreign policy. Kerensky retaliated by dissolving the Diet; but on his overthrow the independence of Finland was recognised by the Bolsheviks. But the joyful realisation of her nationhood was quickly marred by a savage civil war, aided if not kindled by the Bolsheviks, and only terminated by the intervention of German troops at the request of the hard-pressed "White" army and the bourgeoisie. For a brief space the Finns toyed with the notion of a Teutonic King; but on the defeat of Germany in the West they returned to their democratic traditions and established a Republic.

While the claims of Finland had long been widely known, it was not till the Great War that the world became aware of the national aspirations of the Baltic Provinces. Esthonia, Livonia and Courland have for centuries been the pawns and victims of their neighbours; and their history is the record of their successive domination by Teutonic Knights, Swedes and Russians. A Russian victory would have riveted the yoke of Petrograd, and a German triumph would have made them serfs of Potsdam; but the collapse of both Empires provided the unexpected opportunity of an independent life. The three Baltic Provinces are inhabited by two races, and there are to-day, therefore, only two states. Esthonia is of the same racial stock as the Finns across the Gulf, and has maintained its language and individuality intact. Like other subject nationalities of Russia, the Esthonians raised their heads in 1905, but were quickly suppressed. On the fall of the

Tsardom in 1917 the Diet was summoned by the Kerensky Government and asked to become a federal member of the Russian Republic. When the Peace of Brest-Litovsk severed the link with Russia, Germany undertook to decide the future government in accordance with the wishes of the population. German troops entered and occupied the country during 1918; but on the collapse of their new masters the Esthonians declared their independence, and established the government of the Republic at Reval.

Livonia and Courland have united to form the Republic of Latvia, with Riga for its capital. While the Esthonians belong to the Asiatic stock of which the Finns and the Tartars, the Magyars and the Bulgarians are branches, the Letts are survivors of the Balts, from whom the Baltic derived its name, and who are equidistant from the Teuton and the Slav members of the Indo-European family. Till a generation ago Livonia and Courland were a German *enclave* in Russia; for though only six per cent. of the population was German, most of the land, wealth and culture was possessed by the descendants of the Teutonic Knights. Thus the peasantry was Lettish, the aristocracy German, and the sovereignty Russian. Though the bureaucracy and the schools were Russianised at the end of the nineteenth century, and the German University of Dorpat was degraded into a Russian high school, the social and economic domination of the Germans Barons remained unchanged; and when the peasantry rose in revolt in 1905 the dominant races made common cause. Courland was conquered by Germany at the beginning of the great war, and Livonia at the end. Like Esthonia

they were severed from Russia by the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk and drawn within the German orbit, only to be released by the Teutonic *débâcle* a few months later.

The outbreak of a world war opened up a prospect for the Poles to regain their place among the nations of Europe. The Grand Duke Nicholas, Commander-in-Chief of the Russian armies, issued an eloquent Proclamation promising reunion under the Russian flag; but the Tsar took no steps to win the confidence of his Polish subjects, who placed no reliance on the promises of their oppressor, and whose goal was no longer a precarious autonomy but complete independence. So profound, indeed, was the antagonism that ardent patriots under the lead of Pilsudski crossed the border and fought in the Austrian army against the Tsar. Terrible as was the suffering involved in the conquest of Poland by the Central Powers in 1915, few Polish tears were shed at the defeat of Russia. The first and longest step towards their national emancipation had been taken.

The Poles met the invaders with courage and dignity; and it suited the interests of the Central Powers to make concessions to Polish nationality. Town Councils were permitted in Warsaw and other cities, and Polish lectures were delivered in Warsaw and Vilna. After long negotiations the German and Austrian Emperors proclaimed in the autumn of 1916 the creation of an independent Poland, postponing the delimitation of its frontiers and the selection of its ruler to a later date. The Russian revolution in 1917 and the cession of Poland by the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk relieved the country of further apprehension from the east; and the collapse of

her new masters in 1918 removed her oppressors on the west and south. It was a dramatic moment when the tortured Poles could look round on the three Powers who had torn their country to pieces and see their proud empires lying in the dust. With Russia, Germany and Austria defeated, the way was at last clear for an independent Poland. General Piludski, the national hero, became the first President of the Republic, and Paderewski, the most celebrated of living Poles, the first Prime Minister. The reappearance of Poland as a sovereign state after more than a century of partition and subjugation may be regarded as the greatest constructive result of the war.

For four centuries Lithuania was linked to Poland by a common ruler; and after it fell to Russia in the Partitions the Lithuanian Poles—among them Kosciusko, Mickiewicz and Sienkiewicz—have done their full share in keeping alive the soul of the Polish nation. But though the landowning nobility and the Vilna Intellectuals are Poles, the Lithuanian peasant is of widely different stock, closely related in blood and language to their Lettish neighbours. Till the middle of the nineteenth century the country was held to be Polish, its newspapers appearing in Polish, and the University of Vilna being Polish till its suppression. But the language survived among the peasantry and was fostered by the clergy. The subject races of Russia have had to fight on two fronts,—the Finns against Swedes and Russians, the Letts against Germans and Russians, the Lithuanians against Poles and Russians. Lithuania raised her voice in 1905, and a National Assembly at Vilna begged for autonomy and secured the recognition of

its language. But with the failure of the reform movement the province fell back into vassalage, and only emerged after the collapse of Russia and Germany. It is for the new Republic to decide whether it will enter into political or economic union with the Baltic States, with Poland or with Russia.

Pursuing our journey south we reach the race described in Russia as Little Russians, and in Austria as Ruthenes and most generally known as Ukranians, a Slavonic race of nearly thirty millions, with its centre in Kiev. The larger part of the Ukraine, or "borderland" between Poland, Turkey and Russia, transferred its allegiance from the former to the Tsar Alexis, the father of Peter the Great, the smaller part passing with the rest of Galicia to Austria in the First Partition of Poland. The Ukraine was robbed of its autonomy by Peter the Great and Catherine the Great; and its language only lingered on among the peasantry. The songs of Schevtschenko, followed by the Russian revolution of 1905, opened the flood-gates of national sentiment. Newspapers in the popular tongue were founded, books and pamphlets poured from the press, and the demand arose for national autonomy within a federalised Russia. Two years later reaction had triumphed under Stolypin. The Ukranian deputies disappeared from the Duma, the press was muzzled, and the language banished from the schools. Their comrades in Galicia, on the other hand, though in practice subject to the Polish Governor and the Polish landowners, were not unkindly treated by the Hapsburgs, who respected the Uniate Church with its married clergy, and founded some Ruthene chairs in the Polish University at Lemberg; and it was from

the Austrian side of the frontier that the initiative to national revival now came. The division of the race by a political frontier and a religious antagonism gave rise to endless propaganda, and contributed to the acute tension between Russia and Austria which led to the great war. The insane conduct of Russia in 1914 in banishing the Uniate Metropolitan of Lemberg and persecuting the Jews bore its natural fruit in rejoicing when the invaders were expelled. But when Russia and Austria were in turn overthrown, the Ukraine, under the leadership of the Lemberg historian, Professor Kruchevsky, separated itself from Russia and concluded peace with the Central Powers, while the Bolsheviks were still engaged in negotiations. The boundaries of the province governed from the ancient capital of Kieff were extended to embrace the mineral wealth of the south; but the Galician Ruthenes, after a fierce struggle for their liberty, were compelled by Polish arms to form part of the new Poland. The difference of race and language between Ruthenes and Russians is so slight that the Ruthene nationality may well find scope as a member of a Russian federal Republic. Bessarabia, on the other hand, is likely to remain part of the enlarged Roumanian Kingdom.

The natural frontier of Russia on the south east is the Caucasus; and it was not till 1783 that the ancient kingdom of Georgia sought protection from Persian encroachments at the hands of Catherine the Great. But protection developed into annexation, and in 1801 Georgia became a Russian province. A generation later the cause of Transcaucasian independence found a heroic leader in Shamyl, who for twenty-five years

maintained a guerilla warfare. The close of the Crimean war enabled Russia to despatch overwhelming forces to the Caucasus, and Shamyl was captured in 1859. The next bid for liberty followed the victory of Japan in 1905; but in Georgia, as in every other subject province, resistance was drowned in blood. Not until the Tsardom vanished in the crucible of the world war and Bolshevism was in the saddle could Transcaucasia raise its head; and in 1920 the Supreme Council accorded a *de facto* recognition to the Republic of Georgia.

III

The Great War was inaugurated in Vienna, and the ensuing dissolution of the Hapsburg Empire gave free play to the nationalities which were held in varying degrees of subjection by the Germans and Magyars. Galicia has returned to Poland. Bohemia, the richest province of Austria, has regained her place among independent states which she lost on the death of her last King in the battle of Mohacz. The great majority of Czechs would have been content, like their political leader Kramarz, with the revival of the Bohemian Kingdom within the Hapsburg Empire, Bohemia possessing the same rights as Hungary. But a party led by Professor Masaryk, the most distinguished Slav scholar in Austria and a prominent member of the Reichsrath, gradually reached the conviction that Bohemia must regain her independence. The disinclination of the Czechs to fight against Russia, the reign of terror at Prague, the cry of self-determination, the unflagging efforts of Professor Masaryk to win

support for the principle of independence in England, France and America, and the organisation of a Czecho-Slovak army from among the prisoners of Russia, prepared the ground for the restoration of Bohemia when the Hapsburg Monarchy crumbled under the blows of the Allies. The new state emerged as the Czecho-Slovak Republic, consisting of Bohemia, Moravia and the districts of North-West Hungary inhabited by the kindred Slovaks. The presence of over three million Germans in the new state calls for tolerant statesmanship; and the difference between industrial and progressive Bohemia, on the one hand, and clerical and agricultural Slovakia on the other points to generous autonomy. Yet Czecho-Slovakia, with Masaryk, himself a Slovak, as her first President, and with her mineral resources and her industrious and highly-educated population, has perhaps a fairer prospect of success than any of the new states of Central and Eastern Europe.

While the claims of nationality were recognised by the victorious Allies in every other portion of the Hapsburg Empire, they were denied to German Austria. Cut off from the minerals of Bohemia and the corn and cattle of the Hungarian plain, separated from the Adriatic by the extension of Italy's frontiers, and burdened by a gigantic capital city, the one chance of life for the tiny Republic was to unite with Germany. True, however, to her instinct of weakening her principal enemy, France vetoed the union despite the wish of its inhabitants. Hungary, the second partner in the old firm, has indeed obtained the independence which was the dream of Kossuth; but the new state emerges with less than half its territory and population, losing

Transylvania and the Banat of Temesvar to Roumania, the Slovak districts of the north and west to Bohemia, and Croatia to the Jugo-Slavs.

While the northern Slav races were transferred from the rule of Vienna to that of Warsaw and Prague, the southern Slavs grouped themselves into Jugoslavia, of which Serbia forms the nucleus. Its northern outpost, the Slovenes, a little race of two and a half million peasants, have only recently developed national self-consciousness. Having never enjoyed independence, and being too few to form a state of their own, they are content to form part of a larger whole. The ideal of Jugoslav consolidation dates from Napoleon, who grouped the southern territories ceded by Austria into a state called Les Pays Illyriens with its capital at Laibach. When Illyria reverted to Austria the spirit of Jugoslav nationalism was nourished by the poems of Ludovic Gaj; and in the second half of the century the creation of a Parliament in Vienna and of provincial Diets provided the Slovenes with the opportunity of securing political experience. The first Slovene daily paper was founded by Joseph Vosnjak, and the co-operative movement was established by his brother Michael. But though Austria was the chief obstacle to Jugoslav unity, the Slovenes have also had to reckon with the ambitions of Italian Imperialism.

While the Slovenes have been almost hidden from sight, Croatia has played its part in history. Attached to the Hungarian crown since the Middle Ages, it has always enjoyed a varying measure of self-government; and when Hungary received complete self-government by the Compromise of 1867, she granted statutory

autonomy to Croatia. A few years later a Jugoslav Academy of Science and Art was founded at Agram by Bishop Strossmayer, the greatest of modern Croatians, and a University was established by the Government. Though Croatia enjoyed a liberty possessed by no other part of Hungary, the arrogant racialism of the Magyars led to constant friction and to the periodical suspension of the constitution. Hungary's task was facilitated by the fact that Croatia is inhabited by the Croats and the Serbs, who, although closely related, are sundered by religious differences, the Croats being Catholics, the Serbs Orthodox, and by the use of different alphabets, the former employing Roman letters, the latter Slavonic. It was the natural policy of the Catholic Magyars, zealously pursued since the appointment of Khuen Hedervary as Ban in 1883, to favour the Catholic Croats and to play them off against the Serbs. But in 1905 the two races combined in opposition under the lead of Supilo, a young Dalmatian journalist, and began to think seriously of escaping from Austro-Hungarian rule.

The conduct of judges and prosecutors in 1909 at the Agram treason trial of the Serb leaders, who were accused of being in the pay of Belgrad, the revelations of forgery in the Friedjung trial which followed, and the abolition of the Constitution in 1912 increased resentment to boiling point. The unconcealed disinclination to fight against their brother Slavs of Russia and Serbia provoked the vengeance of the Government; and the collapse of the Central Powers was promptly followed by the creation of the Jugoslav state for which King Peter of Serbia and his chief adviser Pasitch had been

striving, with Russian encouragement, ever since the Austrian annexation of Bosnia in 1908, if not indeed since the murder of the Austrophil King Alexander in 1903. With the Slovene districts of Austria, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Dalmatia and Montenegro added to the Serbian nucleus, Jugoslavia emerges from the great struggle a state of about the same size as its sister Czecho-Slovakia.

IV

The liquidation of Turkey in Europe was almost complete before the Great War; but her defeat has emancipated nationalities on the other side of the straits over which she has long held sway.

The history of Armenia is above all the record of unflinching fidelity to the Christian faith. While large numbers of Balkan Christians embraced Islam at the time of the Turkish conquest, Armenians have steadily refused to purchase life and safety at the cost of apostasy. Their nationality has been built up round their Church, which traces back to St. Gregory Thaumaturgus in the third century. Sandwiched between their Turkish rulers and their marauding Kurdish fellow-subjects, the hardworking villagers offered a tempting prey. The Congress of Berlin handed over the northern half of the Armenian districts, including Etchmiadzin, the Armenian Mecca, to Russia, and extracted a promise of reforms for the south. But the reforms were never introduced, and the sympathetic interest of Great Britain and the United States aroused the suspicions of Constantinople. It was not religious intolerance, but

fear of conspiracy that goaded Abdul Hamid to massacre the most cultured and gifted of his Asiatic subjects. In 1894-5 the savage Kurds, armed by the Sultan and aided by Turkish troops, fell upon the Armenians and butchered them by thousands. In 1896 a band of desperate men seized the Ottoman bank in Constantinople, and for two days the capital ran with Armenian blood. The Powers were disunited; for Russia, whom England had checkmated in 1878, now declined to co-operate with England. A shudder ran through Europe; but the Great Assassin remained unpunished. In 1908 the Armenians believed for a moment that their troubles were over; but the massacre of Adana in 1909 announced that the Young Turks were no better than the old. On the outbreak of the Great War the Turkish Armenians made no attempt to conceal their wishes for the victory of Russia, and volunteers fought in the Russian ranks. The vengeance of Enver and Talaat, who were only waiting for a pretext, was terrible, and the greatest massacre in the blood-stained annals of Armenia was carried out. On the defeat of Turkey three years later the survivors united with the Republic of Erivan, already instituted by their brothers on the Russian side of the frontier.

The overthrow of Turkey involved the independence of Arabia, and kindled Arab ambitions in Syria and Mesopotamia. But perhaps the most interesting result of the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire to the historian of nationalism is the opening of Palestine to Jewish settlement under the British flag. The wave of Anti-Semitism which spread through Russia and Roumania, Austria, Germany and France in the last two decades of

the nineteenth century revived the age-long aspiration of a return of the Jews to the land of their fathers, which had begun on a small scale with the agricultural settlements organised by Sir Moses Montefiore and Baron Hirsch. In 1896 Herzl, a Vienna journalist, outlined a plan of an autonomous republic under the Sultan. The scheme was warmly embraced by Max Nordau, Zangwill and other influential leaders, and the first Zionist Congress was held at Basel in 1897; but the difficulties of the project soon became apparent. Abdul Hamid was sympathetic, but failed to make a satisfactory offer. Russia was hostile, and Germany unfriendly. The prosperous Jews of the West had no wish to exchange the comforts of civilisation for the barren soil of Palestine. The death of Herzl in 1904 deprived the Zionist movement of its inspired leader, and little was heard of it till Allenby presented Great Britain with Palestine. While the existing Mussulman majority and the infertility of the soil will prevent the Jews transforming Palestine into a Jewish state, the British Government has promised facilities for an Imperium in Imperio, which will, at any rate, partially fulfil the aspirations of Jewish nationalism.

V

The loud-tongued proclamation by the Allies of the right of subject peoples to self-determination found an echo not only among the oppressed races of Germany and Austria, Russia and Turkey, but within the borders of the British Empire. What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. In Ireland the Home Rule

movement, ably led by Redmond and Dillon, was superseded by the party of Sinn Fein, founded by Arthur Griffith and led by de Valera, which, exasperated by the delay in granting self-government, revived the Fenian demand for a Republic. At the General Election of 1918 the Constitutional Nationalists were routed, and Catholic Ireland voted Sinn Fein, the elected members declining to take their seats at Westminster. The open antagonism between the executive and the people renewed the familiar tragedy of outrage and coercion. It is typical of the malign fate which seems to dog the footsteps of the Irish race that by the time British Unionists were converted to Home Rule, Catholic Ireland had ceased to be content with its limitations.

The Indian problem has been handled with far greater courage and success. The contribution of Indians to the Empire's need was universally recognised to demand a corresponding reward; and in August, 1917, Mr. Montagu announced the Cabinet policy of "the increasing association of Indians in every branch of the administration and the gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to the progressive realisation of responsible government as an integral part of the British Empire." After a visit to India the Secretary of State outlined a programme of political reform in a report which ranks with the Canadian pronouncement of Lord Durham; and in 1919 its main proposals were incorporated in an Act of Parliament which frankly recognised that India had come of age.

While the aspirations of educated Indians were being in large measure realised, the distaste of Egypt for alien rule was forgotten by harassed British statesmen in the

crisis of the conflict. The deposition of the Sultan and the proclamation of a British Protectorate, without consultation or explanation, at the moment that Turkey entered the war, gave a shock to national sentiment the severity of which was not measured by those who inflicted it; and the hardships of compulsory service in the Egyptian Labour Corps inflamed the fellahin with hatred of his alien rulers. When the war was over sporadic revolts broke out; and Egyptian Nationalism, led by the respected ex-Minister of Education, Zagloul Pasha, revived the demand for the evacuation of the country in accordance with the promises of British statesmen when the occupation commenced.

The gospel that a people with a distinct national culture and self-consciousness should be allowed to live its own life shows no sign of losing its power; for it is the expression of a profound and legitimate human instinct. Yet the doctrine of nationality, like its twin, the sovereignty of the people, has had a chequered career. Its explosive force has torn unjust treaties to shreds and shattered despotic empires. But it has also fostered savage racial passion and repulsive national arrogance, and the cult of "sacred egotism" has almost obliterated the sense that civilisation is a collective achievement and a common responsibility. Only when each nation respects the rights and aspirations of its fellows as its own, and recognises in theory and practice its subordination to the welfare of humanity, can a league of contented peoples bring healing to a distracted world.

BOOKS RECOMMENDED

GENERAL

Holland Rose, Nationality as a Factor in Modern History; Ramsay Muir, Nationalism and Internationalism; Johannet, Le Principe des Nationalités; Oakesmith, Race and Nationality; Zangwill, The Principle of Nationalities; Zimmern, Nationality and Government, chapters II-IV; Acton, History of Freedom and other Essays (essay on Nationality); Alison Phillips, Modern Europe; Fyffe, Modern Europe, 1792-1878; Cambridge Modern History, vols. VIII-XII.

CHAPTER I

Madelin, The French Revolution; Treitschke, History of Germany in the Nineteenth Century, Vol. I; Gooch, Germany and the French Revolution; Seeley, Life and Times of Stein, three vols.; Martin Hume, Modern Spain; Oman, History of the Peninsular War.

CHAPTER II

Alison Phillips, The War of Greek Independence; E. F. Benson, The Vintage (a historical novel on the Greek revolt); Alison Phillips, Poland; Vambery, Hungary; Arnold-Forster, Francis Deak; Lutzow, History of Bohemia; Dunlop, O'Connell; Duffy, Young Ireland; Mrs. J. R. Green, Irish Nationality.

CHAPTER III

Bolton King, History of Italian Unity, two vols.; Bolton King, Mazzini; Thayer, Life of Cavour, two vols.; Trevelyan, Garibaldi, three vols.; Stillman, Francesco Crispi; A. W. Ward, Germany, 1815-1907, three vols.; W. H. Dawson, The German Empire, 1867-1914, two vols.; Grant Robertson, Bismarck; H. W. C. Davis, The Political Thought of Treitschke.

CHAPTER IV

Miller, The Balkans, and The Ottoman Empire; Seton-Watson, The Rise of Nationality in the Balkans; Reminiscences of the King of Roumania, edited by Sidney Whitman; Temperley, History of Serbia; Beaman, Stambuloff; Vazof, Under the Yoke (Bulgarian historical novel).

CHAPTER V

W. O'Brien, Memoirs; Barry O'Brien, Life of Parnell; Theal, History of South Africa; Kruger, Memoirs; E. T. Cook, Rights and Wrongs of the Transvaal War; A. Reade, Finland and the Finns; C. R. Buxton, Turkey in Revolution; Abbott, Turkey in Transition.

CHAPTER VI

Okuma, Fifty Years of New Japan; Bland and Backhouse, China under the Empress Dowager; Wedderburn, Life of Allan Hume; Bevan, Indian Nationalism; E. G. Browne, The Persian Revolution; Shuster, The Strangling of Persia; Lord Cromer, Modern Egypt, and Abbas II; Wilfrid Blunt, The Secret History of the British Occupation of Egypt, and My Diaries, two vols.

CHAPTER VII

A. Toynbee, Nationality and the War; R. Butler, The New Eastern Europe; Seton-Watson, The Southern Slavs; Racial Problems of Hungary, and Europe in the Melting-Pot; Benes, Bohemia's Case for Independence; Vosnjak, A Bulwark against Germany (The Slovenes); Noel and Charles Buxton, The War and the Balkans; Noel and Harold Buxton, Travel and Politics in Armenia; R. M. Henry, The Evolution of Sinn Fein.

Headley Bros, 18 Devonshire St, E C 2, and Ashford, Kent

A new series edited by G. LOWES DICKINSON

The Swarthmore INTERNATIONAL HANDBOOKS

1 CAUSES OF INTERNATIONAL WAR
G. Lowes Dickinson

2 PSYCHOLOGY OF NATIONALISM AND PATRIOTISM
J. L. Stocks

3 NATIONALISM
G. P. Gooch

4 THE MACHINERY OF DIPLOMACY
Geo. Young

5 ECONOMIC IMPERIALISM
L. S. Woolf

6 THE WORKERS' INTERNATIONAL
R. W. Postgate

7 UNIFYING THE WORLD
G. N. Clark

Price each, 2s. 6d. net

THE SWARTHMORE PRESS LTD.